



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/86
17 October 2001

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 Geneva from 10 to 14 September 2001

*Distributed by the Central Office for International Carriage by Rail (OCTI) under the symbol OCTI/RID/GT-III/2001-B.

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
Attendance	1	3
Adoption of the agenda	2 - 7	3
Harmonization with the United Nations Model Regulations (Twelfth revised edition of the United Nations Recommendations)	8 - 45	4
Implementation of the restructured RID/ADR	46 - 58	9
New proposals	59 - 64	11
Tanks	65 - 78	12
Election of officers for 2002.....	79	14
Future work	80 - 83	14
Condolences	84	15
Tribute to Mr. Grieder	85	15
Adoption of the report and its annexes.....	86	15

Annexes

Annex 1:	Texts adopted by the Joint Meeting	
–	Draft amendments to Parts 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7 of RID and ADR	TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/86/Add.1 OCTI-RID/CE/38/4(a)
–	Draft amendments to Part 4 of RID and ADR	TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/86/Add.2 OCTI-RID/CE/38/4(b)
–	Draft amendments to Part 6 of RID and ADR	TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/86/Add.3 OCTI-RID/CE/38/4(c)
Annex 2:	Report of the ad hoc working group on tanks	TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/86/Add.4

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 Geneva from 10 to 14 September 2001, 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; Bulgaria; Czech Republic; Denmark; Finland; France; Germany; Hungary; Ireland; Italy; Liechtenstein; Netherlands; Norway; Poland; Portugal; Romania; Russian Federation; Slovakia; Slovenia; Spain; Sweden; Switzerland; Tunisia; United Kingdom. The European Commission was also represented. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) also participated. The following international non-governmental organizations were represented: International Union of Railways (UIC); European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC); International Road Transport Union (IRU); European Liquefied Petroleum Gas Association (AEGPL); European Industrial Gases Association (EIGA); European Committee for Standardization (CEN); International Union of Private Wagons (UIP); International Federation of Forwarding Agents' Associations (FIATA); Permanent International Vinegar Committee (PIVC).

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Documents: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/85 (Circular letter A 82-01/502.2001 of the Central Office for International Carriage by Rail) (OCTI)

Informal documents: INF.1A and INF.1B

2. The Joint Meeting adopted the agenda as amended by informal documents INF.1A and INF.1B.

3. The representative of the Netherlands asked whether the date of the entry into force of the next amendment to RID and ADR had already been discussed and whether a period of transition had been decided. He said that a transitional period of one year would be scheduled for the IMDG Code.

4. The representative of IMO invited delegates to note that if amendment 31 to the IMDG Code were adopted next year by IMO's Maritime Safety Committee, it would be ready to be brought into force on a voluntary basis as from 1 January 2003, and that IMO's Maritime Safety Committee had decided that the IMDG Code should become mandatory under the SOLAS Convention as from 1 January 2004.

5. The Chairman pointed out that the present 18-month period of transition for the restructured RID and ADR had been calculated to coincide with the entry into force of the next amendment which should therefore enter into force on 1 January 2003 with the usual transitional period of six months.

Ad hoc working group on harmonization

6. An ad hoc working group was given the task of carrying out an editorial review of the documents prepared by the UN/ECE secretariat on harmonization with the United Nations Model Regulations (TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/23, -/2001/24, -/2001/25 and -/2001/26) and the comments on them (informal documents INF.19 and INF.21).

Ad hoc working group on tanks

7. The following documents were entrusted to the working group:

TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/11, -/2001/34, -/2001/46, -/2001/51, -/2001/52, INF.10, INF.11, INF.12, INF.14, INF.22, INF.26, INF.28 and INF.31.

HARMONIZATION WITH THE UNITED NATIONS MODEL REGULATIONS (TWELFTH REVISED EDITION OF THE UNITED NATIONS RECOMMENDATIONS)

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/53 (France)

8. The proposal by France to bring packing instruction P402 into line with the United Nations Model Regulations was adopted.

Informal document INF.13 (Switzerland/Liechtenstein)

9. The representative of Switzerland introduced the document. A small ad hoc working group was made responsible for considering it but was unable to reach agreement because of a problem of interpretation of the report of the last session of the Joint Meeting. It proposed that the Joint Meeting should agree on a mandate for total or partial harmonization with the Model Regulations.

10. It was recalled that the Joint Meeting had deliberately decided against harmonizing RID/ADR in respect of rear placarding, in view of the importance of such placarding in the event of emergency response. Harmonization regarding the lateral placarding of compartments, however, had been accepted.

11. The representative of Germany proposed that the systematic structure of RID/ADR should not be modified and that the last sentence of 5.3.1.1.4 of the Model Regulations should be included both in 5.3.1.2 and in 5.3.1.4 of RID/ADR. He suggested that the exception for petroleum products should be taken into account.

12. It was further suggested that the Model Regulations should take account of the provision contained in paragraph 5.3.1.2 of RID/ADR for the purpose of harmonizing the regulations for the various transport modes in respect of end placarding of vehicles.

13. The Joint Meeting adopted the proposal prepared by the representative of Germany with the assistance of the representative of France and contained in informal document INF.13 bis, replacing informal document INF.23, with some amendments (see annex 1). The texts in question concerned 5.3.1.2 and 5.3.1.4 only.

14. The MEGCs were kept in 5.3.1.2 so as not to prejudge the future, although this equipment was currently intended only for the carriage of a single product.

15. In 5.3.1.4 it was specified that if all compartments had to carry the same placards, they only required to be affixed once on each side and, for ADR, at the rear of the vehicle.

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/49 (EIGA)

Informal document: INF.24 (AEGPL)

16. The representative of EIGA introduced his document on bringing provisions on the marking of RID/ADR receptacles (Chapter 6.2) into line with those of the “UN” certified receptacles of the Model Regulations (new section 6.2.5 of RID/ADR), and specified that the amendments were not substantive. He said that it was both necessary and urgent for his industry that the provisions should be brought into line. He pointed out that RID/ADR receptacles could still be constructed according to provisions which were not norms, for example, according to RID/ADR, although it was not current practice and although 6.2.1.7.1 did not explicitly specify it and transitional measures had to be envisaged for the marking of RID/ADR receptacles.

17. In informal document INF.24, the representative of AEGPL expressed the wish for a derogation for GPL cylinders, since the work of standardization in that context was not yet complete and a relevant proposal would be submitted to the United Nations Sub-Committee.

18. The Joint Meeting entrusted a small ad hoc working group with settling questions still pending.

19. The representative of Switzerland, supported by the representative of Germany, contested the harmonization of the marking of gas receptacles with the United Nations Recommendations. He explained that there was no need for it and also considered that the proposed chronological change of “month/year” to “year/month” could lead to erroneous information.

20. The small ad hoc working group introduced its proposed amendments (informal document INF.38 (EIGA)) to the initial document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/49 to take account of special cases for pressure receptacles for liquefied petroleum gas (LPG). These amendments were adopted by the Joint Meeting with some minor changes (see annex 1).

21. The proposal by France contained in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1998/45, adopted by the Joint Meeting in September 2000, was incorporated in 6.2.1.7.7.

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/41 (EIGA)

22. This document, which proposed consequential amendments to section 4.3.3 and to 2.2.2.1.5 to take account of changes to the definitions for compressed gases, was adopted with a number of corrections (see annex 1).

Informal document: INF.3 (UN/ECE)

23. The Joint Meeting adopted this document concerning classification criteria for substances used in the production of tear gas (e.g. UN No. 1693). The UN/ECE secretariat would also submit a document to the Sub-Committee of Experts in order to correct the Model Regulations.

Aerosols

Informal document: INF.18 (UN/ECE)

24. This document was prepared by the UN/ECE secretariat at the request of the Joint Meeting following the decision not to introduce revised special provision 63 of the United Nations Model Regulations into Chapter 3.3 of RID/ADR but rather to reflect it in section 2.2.2, for example, in Note 2 to 2.2.2.1.3.

25. After lengthy discussion of the secretariat's proposal, the representative of Italy proposed that a single entry should be maintained for aerosols and special provision 63 applied to it as in the United Nations Model Regulations. This proposal was rejected.

26. The Joint Meeting noted that the United Nations Model Regulations made no provision for labelling for subsidiary risks of Classes 6.1 and 8, except for air transport, but decided that this subsidiary labelling would also be required by RID and ADR.

27. The Joint Meeting also noted that the Model Regulations made no provision for labelling aerosols for the risk of oxidizing, but decided that this labelling should be provided for aerosols filled with oxidizing gases since RID/ADR currently made provision for this case.

28. It was, however, noted that the only cases that could be envisaged would be the use of oxygen or nitrous oxide as propellant gases and it should be checked with industry whether such cases existed in practice and whether, when filled in aerosol dispensers, these gases actually presented a risk justifying Class 5.1 labelling.

29. It was decided that no account would be taken of oxidizing liquids or solids that might possibly be contained in an aerosol dispenser in that there were no data for assessment of potential risks or criteria for this particular case.

30. In accordance with packing instruction P 204, it was decided to prohibit the use of pyrophoric gases as propellant gases.

31. The secretariat's proposal was adopted with some drafting amendments, in particular to reflect the above decisions (see annex 1).

Special provision 640

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/44 (France)

Informal document: INF.5 (Austria)

32. The representative of Norway, supported by the representative of the United Kingdom, proposed that special provision 640 should be deleted. This proposal was put to the vote but was not adopted (8 votes in favour, with 9 against).

33. The proposal by France to amend the special provision was adopted with the amendments proposed by the representatives of Italy and Germany (see annex 1).

34. The Joint Meeting considered that it was unnecessary to specify in 5.4.1.1.1, as Austria had proposed (INF.5), where in the transport document the additional particulars required by special provision 640 should appear.

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/24 (UN/ECE secretariat)

Informal document: INF.21 (OCTI)

35. The UN/ECE secretariat document on the harmonization of Part 5 of RID/ADR with the United Nations Model Regulations had already been studied at the previous meeting in the light of several other proposals (TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/84, paras. 55 to 84). The ad hoc working group (see para. 6) had not had time to study questions of drafting. The Chairman therefore asked if other problems remained to be solved.

36. In 5.2.2.2.1.6, the representative of Germany, supported by the representatives of Switzerland and Liechtenstein, said that he objected to the addition of a paragraph (c) to permit the use in UN No. 1965 of the background colour of gas cylinders as the colour for the texts and the symbol of the flame instead of black or white, provided that this colour contrasted with the red background of the label. In view of the reservation entered by Germany, according to which the requirement of "adequate contrast" was not clear and would lead to problems, the secretary of UN/ECE and the representative of AEGPL explained that it was obvious that it would not be possible to resort to this provision if the background colour of the cylinder was red.

37. It was recalled that this decision by the United Nations Committee of Experts derived from a proposal by AEGPL. After voting on the matter, the Joint Meeting decided to bring RID and ADR into line with the United Nations Model Regulations.

38. At the request of the representative of Belgium, the amendment to paragraph 5.4.1.1.3 was not adopted for lack of explanation as to the exact interpretation of the idea of carriage “for processing for disposal.”

39. The rest of the document was adopted, bearing in mind the decisions already taken at the previous session, with some drafting changes (see annex 1).

Chapters 6.1, 6.3, 6.5 and 6.6

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/25 (UN/ECE secretariat)

Informal document: INF.21 (OCTI)

40. In paragraphs 6.1.1.5, 6.3.1.5, 6.4.2.12 and 6.6.1.4, the representative of Germany requested that the text should specify what was meant by “information regarding procedures to be followed”. The Joint Meeting considered that a proposal should first be made to the United Nations Committee of Experts.

41. In the heading of 6.5.4.14, the Joint Meeting decided that the word “individual” should be kept.

42. In 6.6.5.3.2.2, the representative of Belgium requested the application to all large packagings and not only to flexible large packagings of the requirement that the load should be evenly distributed. He was asked to submit an initial proposal to the United Nations Committee of Experts.

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/23 (UN/ECE secretariat)

Informal document: INF.39

43. The amendments contained in informal document INF.39 and proposed by the small ad hoc working group were adopted.

44. The Joint Meeting opted for the French version of 4.1.7.2.4, which covered both metal and composite IBCs, whereas the English version referred only to metal IBCs.

45. The Joint Meeting also decided not to include special provision B13 in 4.1.4.2.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RESTRUCTURED RID/ADR

Packing instruction P200 for substances not assigned to Class 2

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/28 (Germany)

Informal document: INF.37

46. Informal document INF.37 followed on from the discussion on document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/28 at the previous session (see TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/84, paras. 90-98). The proposals by Germany were adopted with some changes (see annex 1).

Report of the working group on section 1.8.5 (accident/incident)

Informal document: INF.20 (Germany)

47. The representative of Germany presented the results obtained at the last meeting of the working group (Bonn-Mainz, 30 and 31 August 2001), which was the subject of a final text concerning the definition and the criteria leading to a mandatory report by the carrier or his agent/rail infrastructure manager, and a report form adopted by the working group.

48. It was agreed that the specific aspects of Class 7 (Annex 2 of informal document INF.20) should be incorporated into the proposed text of 1.8.5.3.

49. The representatives of the United Kingdom and Portugal stressed that the informal report of the working group had been submitted as an informal document which had been available during the meeting and that they had not therefore been in a position to carry out the necessary consultations in their respective countries. They hoped that consideration of the document could be postponed until a later session, in particular so that it would not be necessary to amend the requirements adopted at the present session in two years' time if difficulties occurred in implementation.

50. Several delegations recalled that the transitional period for the implementation of section 1.8.5 would expire on 31 December 2002 and that it would be necessary to have more detailed requirements so that it could be implemented more effectively.

51. The Joint Meeting decided to adopt a new paragraph 1.8.5.3 at the current session and a model report the use of which would be mandatory (see annex 1).

52. It was pointed out that the model report concerned the carrier's report to the competent authority (1.8.5.1), but that 1.8.5.2 provided for another report (that of the competent authority to the secretariat). The OCTI secretariat requested that this latter report should also be standardized.

53. In the opinion of the representative of Portugal, the mandate of the working group where the report was concerned covered only the report of the competent authority to the secretariat and not the carrier's report to the competent authorities. The Joint Meeting did not share that point of view.

54. Some delegations suggested that the carrier's report should be transmitted to the secretariat by the competent authority. Others recalled that paragraph 1.8.5.2 provided for the transmission of these reports to the secretariat only if the competent authorities deemed it necessary. The secretariat said that it would like the reasons for transmitting these reports to it to be defined (preparation of accident statistics or analysis for the purpose of drawing conclusions concerning safety). The Joint Meeting gave no opinion on the subject for lack of time. The discussion could be continued at a later date within the Joint Meeting (see also paras. 13 and 21 of document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/35 on the Frankfurt meeting).

55. The question of the languages to be used to draft these reports was also raised. The secretariat suggested that the carrier's report should be prepared in the language of the country in which the accident had taken place or in another official RID/ADR language, but that the report to be transmitted to the secretariat should be prepared in one of the official working languages of the secretariat concerned (English or French for UN/ECE, German or French for OCTI). The Joint Meeting gave no opinion on the subject for lack of time. That discussion could also be continued at a later date within the Joint Meeting (see also para. 15 of document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/35 on the Frankfurt meeting).

Special provisions B1 and B2 for IBCs

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/43 (CEFIC)

Informal document: INF.41 (UN/ECE secretariat)

56. The Joint Meeting adopted the principle whereby IBCs could be carried in sheeted vehicles or containers under provisions B1 and B2. Since, however, these provisions would no longer correspond to provisions B1 and B2 of the United Nations Model Regulations, and since they concerned transport equipment rather than the packaging itself, it was decided to transfer them from Chapter 4.1 to Chapter 7.2 and, in Table A of Chapter 3.2, from Column 9 to Column 16 in the form of provisions V10 and V11. This policy decision was also valid for all the cases referred to in 7.2.3 and 4.1.2.3 (see annex 1).

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/45 (CEFIC)

Informal documents: INF.36 and INF.43 (France)

57. The representative of France requested the secretariats (OCTI and UN/ECE) to put before the RID Committee of Experts and WP.15 the documents that he had submitted concerning orange marking.

Informal documents: INF.4 (CEN) and INF.17 (France)

58. The Joint Meeting adopted these documents concerning references or changes to references to standards (INF.4) and the inclusion in RID/ADR of sections 6.4.10, 6.4.18 and 6.4.20 of the United Nations Model Regulations (see annex 1). The representative of Switzerland regretted that informal document INF.6 had not been discussed.

NEW PROPOSALS

Transport of fireworks

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/50 (Netherlands)

59. In order to improve the current situation regarding the classification of fireworks, the representative of the Netherlands proposed in his document that a special provision should be included in Chapter 3.3 with a view to making the use of the classification code in accordance with Column 3b of Table A subject to approval by the competent authority and also to make provision for an appropriate reference in the transport document. Since this problem of classification was also on the agenda of the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts and no solution could be forthcoming before December 2002, he said that his proposal was an interim solution to solving the urgent problem of safety as from 1 January 2003 for land transport modes.

Informal document: INF.33 (Norway)

60. So that account could be taken of classification systems which already existed in a number of countries, the representative of Norway proposed an amended text for this special provision, which did not require the first RID/ADR country concerned by the consignment to accept the classification of the country of origin.

61. The representative of France proposed a simplified text in this context which did not refer to the country of origin, since "country of origin" could be interpreted as meaning the country in which the transport operation originated (or the country in which the operation was forwarded from a port in order to avoid the need for reclassification) rather than the country of manufacture. It was agreed that classification approval should precede the transport operation.

62. The representative of Germany explained the system used by the competent authority of Germany which comprised two parts - a categorization of fireworks in terms of specific criteria and a table prepared on the basis of tests and containing various parameters and the classification.

63. The proposal concerning recognition of classification contained in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/50 was adopted in principle. The Joint Meeting accepted the text as amended by the representative of France and the mandatory reference in the transport document (see annex 1).

64. The representative of France said that this problem of classifying fireworks for consignments from a State that was not a Party to RID/ADR or which were initially routed by sea or air was not satisfactorily regulated in terms of the obligations figuring in Chapter 1.4 and that he would submit a proposal on the subject.

TANKS

Informal document: INF.42

65. Through this document, the Chairman of the ad hoc working group (see para. 7) introduced the group's report (reproduced in annex 2 to this report) on its decisions:

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/34 (AEGPL)

66. The working group had disagreed with the incorporation of the provisions of the United Nations Model Regulations concerning UN certified MEGCs in Chapters 4.3 and 6.8 of RID/ADR and had decided that new sections concerning those texts should be inserted in Chapters 4.2 (4.2.4) and 6.7 (6.7.5). The Joint Meeting endorsed that position.

Informal document: INF.26 (EIGA)

67. The working group had decided that this proposal for a new formula for calculating the minimum wall thickness of spherical tanks should be placed in the "Future work" category for a forthcoming session. The representative of EIGA would submit a new document.

Informal document: INF.14 (France) (document TRANS/WP.15/2001/22)

68. This proposal for a new equivalence formula for double-wall tanks had been referred to the WP.15 Working Party because it currently concerned only ADR.

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/11 (CEN)

69. Although it had not been possible for the Joint Meeting to undertake the examination of conformity with the provisions of RID/ADR, in correlation with the proposal by Switzerland concerning the inclusion of standards, this proposal to refer to standards had been approved both by the working group and by the Joint Meeting.

Informal document: INF.31 (Germany)

70. The working group had taken note of this accident to a battery vehicle. The representative of Germany would submit, under the heading of "Future work", a proposal concerning the general context of rear protection of vehicles and a special proposal concerning the protection of the valves of battery vehicles composed of tubes.

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/51 (Netherlands)

71. The working group had reached a consensus on the use of certain types of “hermetically closed tanks” with vacuum relief valves. The Joint Meeting accepted the new texts and the major amendments appearing in annex 1. The RID Committee of Experts would have in particular to give its opinion on the change in the definition of “hermetically closed tank.” The representative of Germany proposed that the question of transitional measures should be transmitted to WP.15 and the RID Committee of Experts.

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/46 (United Kingdom)

72. The working group had decided not to act on this proposal (valve chest below the level of the liquid), but had expressed willingness to resume discussion of it later since it represented a departure from the current concept of safety. The Joint Meeting endorsed that position.

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/52 (UIP)

73. The working group had proposed new wording for the second sentence of special provision TU11. The Joint Meeting accepted that wording (see annex 1).

Informal document: INF.12 (UIP)

74. The representative of UIP had withdrawn his proposal concerning the coding of tanks with automatic venting valves and vacuum-relief valves but without safety valves. The representative of Switzerland would revert to that matter in the Committee of Experts because the provision had come into force for RID in 1995 but not for ADR.

Informal document: INF.10 (Germany)

75. The representative of Germany would submit a new proposal to the Joint Meeting concerning the extension to tank-containers of the provisions for vacuum-operated waste tanks.

Informal document: INF.11 (UIP)

76. The working group had amended this proposal concerning (+) substances, alternative use and tank hierarchy on the basis of informal document INF.44 submitted at the previous session of the Joint Meeting. The Joint Meeting accepted the texts in question with a drafting change proposed by the representative of Belgium (see annex 1).

Informal document: INF.22 (Belgium) (document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/48)

77. The working group had only accepted paragraph 1 of this proposal, namely to adopt the proposal contained in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2001/48 from Belgium (Chapter 4.4). The Joint Meeting endorsed that position.

Informal document: INF.28 (France)

78. The working group had adopted paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.1 (concerning Chapters 4.3 and 6.8). The Joint Meeting endorsed that position (see annex 1).

ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2002

79. On the proposal of the representative of Germany, Mr. Johansen (Norway) was elected Chairman for 2002. On the proposal of the representative of Norway, Mr. Rein (Germany) was elected Vice-Chairman for 2002.

FUTURE WORK

80. The provisional agenda for the next Joint Meeting (Bern, 18-22 March 2002) was adopted:

1. Proposals pending* (priority to be given to the oldest of them)
2. Harmonization (for the 2005 edition of RID/ADR)
3. New proposals
4. Tanks
5. Miscellaneous

81. The authors of informal documents which had not been discussed were requested to submit them officially to the secretariat if they deemed it necessary.

82. The Joint Meeting decided that the working group on tanks should not meet concurrently with the Joint Meeting, but during the week preceding it so that it would be better able to prepare its report and thus facilitate its consideration by the Joint Meeting.

83. Regarding reorganization of the Joint Meetings, the Chairman expressed the earnest hope that, in the context of the harmonization with the revised editions of the United Nations Recommendations, the Joint Meeting would have three weeks of meetings in the year, following the session of the United Nations Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and on the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and labelling of Chemicals.

* Documents -/1998/43, -/1999/16, -/2000/18, -/2000/19, -/2001/4, -/2001/9, -/2001/38, -/2001/39, -/2001/40, -/2001/42, -/2001/47 and informal documents INF.6, INF.7, INF.8, INF.9, INF.15, INF.16, INF.25, INF.27, INF.29, INF.30, INF.32 and INF.34.

CONDOLENCES

84. Following the announcement of the terrorist attacks of 11 September which had cast a tragic shadow over the United States of America, the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman, on behalf of the Joint Meeting, sent a message of condolences and support to the colleagues in the United States Department of Transportation.

TRIBUTE TO MR. GRIEDER

85. The Joint Meeting wished Mr. A. Grieder (Switzerland) a long and happy retirement and expressed its gratitude for his valuable assistance in the work of the Joint Meeting, especially in the working group on accidents/incidents.

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT AND ITS ANNEXES

86. The Joint Meeting adopted its report and its annexes.
