UNITED NATIONS



# Economic and Social Council

# INF.5

Distr. GENERAL

TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/ January 2003

Original: ENGLISH

## **ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

### **INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE**

**Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods** 

<u>Joint Meeting of the RID Safety Committee and the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods</u> (Bern, 24-28 March 2003)

## PART 1 OF RID/ADR

## **Chapter 1.6, Transitional Measures for IBCs**

#### Transmitted by the Expert of Germany

#### Introduction:

With the implementation of the 2001 revised edition of ADR/RID, IBC shall, in acc. with 6.5.2.1.1 be marked with letters, numerals and symbols at least 12 mm high. The previous edition of ADR/RID did not specify the height of the marking. Transitional provisions for existing design types and IBCs are not provided.

## Proposal:

It is proposed to introduce a transitional clause in ADR/RID, Chapter 1.6 in order to clarify the situation. It is proposed, that the revised marking requirements shall apply only to IBC that are manufactured after 31 December 2002, as follows:

**1.6.X.X¹** IBCs manufactured in accordance with the requirements of para. 1612 (1) RID / 3612 (1) ADR applicable up to 31 December 2002 and marked with letters, numerals and symbols less then 12 mm high may be used.

### Justification:

The revision of the IBC marking requirements was a consequential alignment with the marking requirements for packages, which had been including provisions on the size of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The numbering may require the introduction of a new division for packagings, including IBCs and large packagings, because it is the first clause for this category.

marking in earlier editions of ADR/RID. This revision was deemed reasonable to achieve the same level of visibility of the marking.

On the other side, an obligation for existing IBCs to be re-marked in the required size would create tremendous difficulties. Millions of IBCs have been put on the market, crossing borders and changing owners and users.

Any re-marking would require that essential questions would need to be addressed, such as:

- Who is authorized to change the marking,
- How can re-marking be organised crossing borders,
- Which elements of the marking need to re-marked,
- Which technical means are allowed in case of embossed or similar markings,
- Is a double marking allowed,
- And others.