



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/94
27 October 2003

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 1 to 10 September 2003 and
in Bonn from 13 to 17 October 2003**

* Circulated by the Central Office for International Carriage by Rail (OCTI) under the symbol OCTI/RID/GT-III/2003B. Unless otherwise indicated, the other documents referred to in this report under the symbol TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/ followed by the year and a serial number were circulated by OCTI under the symbol OCTI/RID/GT-III/ followed by the year and the same serial number.

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
Attendance	1	3
Organization of the session	2	3
Adoption of the agenda	3	3
Harmonization with the United Nations Model Regulations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods	4 - 48	4
Proposals for amendments to RID/ADR/ADN	49 - 101	11
Security in the transport of dangerous goods	102 - 152	18
Standards	153	25
Tanks	154 - 156	25
Future work	157 - 159	27
Elections	160	27
Miscellaneous	161 - 162	27
Adoption of the report	163 - 164	28

Annexes

Annex 1:	Draft amendments to RID/ADR/ADN adopted by the Joint Meeting in 2003	
	Amendments to Part 1	TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/94/Add.1
	Amendments to Part 2	TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/94/Add.2
	Amendments to Part 3	TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/94/Add.3
	Amendments to Part 4	TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/94/Add.4
	Amendments to Part 5	TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/94/Add.5
	Amendments to Part 6	TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/94/Add.6
	Amendments to Part 7	TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/94/Add.7
Annex 2:	Report of the working group on tanks	TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/94/Add.8

ATTENDANCE

1. The Joint Meeting of the RID Safety Committee and the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE) held the first part of its autumn session in Geneva from 1 to 10 September 2003 and the second part in Bonn from 13 to 17 October 2003 with Mr. C. Pfauvadel (France) 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; Croatia; Czech Republic; Denmark; Finland; France; Germany; Hungary; Ireland; Italy; Latvia; Liechtenstein; Netherlands; Norway; Poland; Portugal; Romania; Russian Federation; Serbia and Montenegro; Slovakia; Slovenia; Spain; Sweden; Switzerland; United Kingdom. The European Commission and the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (MINUK) were also represented. The Danube Commission took part. The following non-governmental organizations were represented: European Liquefied Petroleum Gas Association (AEGPL); International Association of the Soap, Detergent and Maintenance Products Industry (AISE); European Committee for Standardization (CEN); Commercial Balloons Operator of Europe; European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC); European Fertilizer Manufacturers' Association (EFMA); European Aerosols Federation (FEA); International Road Transport Union (IRU); European Industrial Gases Association (EIGA); International Federation of Freight Forwarders Associations (FIATA); International Union of Railways (UIC); International Union of Private Wagons (UIP).

ORGANIZATION OF THE SESSION

2. Since a large number of delegates would not have been able to participate in the second part of the session had it been held in Geneva, the Chairman expressed his sincere thanks on behalf of the Joint Meeting to the Government of Germany and to the secretariats for their efforts to find a solution and for organizing the second part in the premises of the Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing of the Federal Republic of Germany in Bonn.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Documents: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/93 and TRANS//WP.15/2003/60 [Circular letter A 81-02/502.2003 of the Central Office for International Carriage by Rail (OCTI)]

Informal documents: INF.1, INF.2, INF.41 and INF.42/Rev.1 (Secretariat)

3. The Joint Meeting adopted the agenda as prepared by the secretariat and as amended in accordance with informal documents INF.1 and INF.2 (for the first part of the session) and INF.41 and INF.42/Rev.1 (for the second part), with the addition of informal documents INF.3 to INF.32 (for the first part) and INF.33 to INF.60 (for the second part).

HARMONIZATION WITH THE UNITED NATIONS MODEL REGULATIONS ON THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS

Report of the ad hoc working group on the harmonization of RID/ADR/ADN with the United Nations Recommendations

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/56

4. The Joint Meeting welcomed the work of the ad hoc working group and decided to review the texts prepared chapter by chapter. The amendments to the texts proposed in Addenda 1 to 7 of the working group's report were included in the annexes to the draft report (TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/CRP.4 and Add.1-9); the texts adopted can be found in annex 1 to this report.

5. The representative of Norway said that, contrary to what was stated in paragraph 10 of the working group's report, he was not intending to prepare a proposal on the carriage of blasting explosives in tanks for the second half of the session. His proposal would be restricted to the carriage of ammonium nitrate emulsions in tanks (see TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/57, informal document INF.36 and paragraph 155, point 12, of this report).

Part I

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/56/Add.1

6. It was agreed that the meeting would come back to the provisions of Part 1 on infectious substances and bulk containers when these questions were discussed in connection with other parts.

7. The representative of Belgium opposed the proposal by the working group (report TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/56, para. 9) to remove the lower capacity limit of 450 litres for RID/ADR tank-containers intended for the carriage of substances other than gases. The working group's proposal to remove this limit, as in the provisions of the United Nations Model Regulations for portable tanks, was, however, put to the vote and adopted.

8. It was agreed to amend the definition of repaired IBCs as proposed, on the understanding that the addition of the sentence "Flexible IBCs are not repairable unless approved by the competent authority" meant that the competent authority gave its agreement only when assured that the repaired IBC was capable of satisfying the relevant provisions of Chapter 6.5.

9. The Joint Meeting decided not to amend paragraph 1.3.3, since the existing requirement whereby both the employer and the employee were to keep details of all the training undertaken seemed more appropriate than the employee having access to those details only on request.

Part 2

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/56/Add.2

2.2.2.3

Informal documents: INF.4 (UIC) and INF.24 (Secretariat)

10. The representative of UIC informed the Joint Meeting about the problems that would arise in particular for carriage in tanks if entry 1010 concerning butadienes and hydrocarbon mixtures were to be amended in accordance with the United Nations Model Regulations. The concentration of less than 40% butadienes would mean that mixtures containing less than 40% butadienes would have to be carried under an n.o.s. entry (1965 or 3161) and ran the risk of being carried unstabilized.

11. He recalled the steps which had been taken vis-à-vis the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts (see INF.24), and reminded the meeting that these substances were carried in very large quantities in Europe and that a safety issue was at stake.

12. After a lengthy discussion, the Joint Meeting agreed not to amend the existing description of these mixtures which appeared as a lower-case addition to the proper shipping name, while accepting the new name in upper-case. As a result, and in keeping with informal document INF.24, the other consequential amendments concerning the alignment of provisions relating to packing (4.1.4.1, P200) and carriage in RID/ADR tanks (4.3.3.2.5) with the Model Regulations were not adopted. Only the alignment concerning carriage in portable tanks (4.2.5.2.6) remained valid. The amendment of the proper shipping name did not require new transitional measures in view of 1.6.3.8.

13. The representative of Italy pointed out that this decision by the Joint Meeting did not change anything from the safety point of view, since mixtures with vapour pressures higher than the existing description provided could be classified under an n.o.s. entry (1965 or 3161).

Section 2.2.6.1

14. The representative of the Netherlands, supported by the representative of Belgium, considered it premature to introduce new n.o.s. entries for toxic by inhalation substances, in that the list of substances currently referred to by name which could come under the criteria for toxic by inhalation substances had not been established and consequently the conditions for their carriage had not yet been reviewed. They thought it probable that new proposals for these substances would be submitted to the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts.

15. The representative of Switzerland noted that for the time being there was no appropriate RID/ADR classification code for these new entries, some of which could be assigned to two different classification codes.

16. The representative of UIC thought that it would be useful to include these entries for the safety of carriage in tanks in particular. He also pointed out that failure to include them would cause major problems for multimodal transport since maritime and air transport classifications would then be incompatible with European land transport classification.

17. It was, however, noted during the first part of the session that the International Maritime Organization had not yet taken a decision in this regard. The secretariat was requested to convey to the International Maritime Organization (IMO) the Joint Meeting's opinion that it considered the introduction of these entries premature. The final decision would be taken in terms of IMO's decisions in this regard.

18. Since in late September 2003 IMO had adopted these new entries for the IMDG Code, the Joint Meeting decided at the second part of its session also to introduce them into RID/ADR/ADN (see annex 1).

Section 2.2.6.2

19. For the presentation of the provisions of Class 6.2, the Joint Meeting decided to follow the United Nations Model Regulations as closely as possible. The representative of Norway said that the text was far from perfect and that a new editorial revision would probably be necessary in the near future.

Section 2.2.9

20. The Joint Meeting requested the secretariat to amend footnote 11/ to 2.2.9.1.11 in order to include a reference to the appropriate European Directive for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on the prevention of biotechnological risks related to the Convention on Biological Diversity (see annex 1).

Section 2.3.5

Informal document: INF.21 (Netherlands)

21. The representative of the Netherlands proposed that the inclusion of new requirements for pollutants to the aquatic environment in RID/ADR/ADN should be postponed for two years. On the one hand the procedure for the amendment of Annex III of the MARPOL Convention was liable to make IMO delay the inclusion of similar provisions in the IMDG Code. On the other hand, the European Directives on the classification of these substances would not be harmonized with the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS) for 2005. Lastly, the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts was still discussing the conditions of carriage for these substances. He therefore considered that it was preferable to wait until a full set of provisions was available for harmonized implementation as from 2007; this would not be in contradiction with the aims of the GHS (see also document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/56, paras. 24-28).

22. It was noted, however, that present provisions were not satisfactory and that in practice it was necessary to resort to the multilateral agreement M80 for the carriage of these substances. Several delegations therefore preferred to maintain a closed system in which pollutants would be clearly identified and which would not force industry to carry out systematic tests to classify their products according to the criteria of the GHS for the purposes of transport.

23. It was also noted that the new GHS criteria would permit the classification of mixtures containing substances already classified.

24. After a lengthy discussion during the first part of the session, the Joint Meeting accepted the Chairman's proposal to proceed as follows:

- (a) Place the entire text of 2.3.5 in square brackets;
- (b) Draft an additional paragraph to specify that only substances for which data were available and were published in European Directives would be classified as pollutants to the aquatic environment;
- (c) Postpone the discussion and the decision until the second part of the session pending policy decisions by the industry concerned;
- (d) Whatever the decision taken, multilateral agreement M80 should be extended in order to avoid a lacuna in the regulations in 2004.

2.3.5.4.6.5

25. The Joint Meeting similarly took no decision on the question raised by the working group (see document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/56, para. 28). The paragraph would therefore remain in square brackets and the phrase concerning the additional statement would be kept provisionally.

26. During the second part of the session, the Joint Meeting noted that the new Chapter 2.9 of the United Nations Model Regulations would not be introduced into the IMDG Code before October 2006 at earliest.

27. Since the representatives of industry had not taken any decision on the issue, the Joint Meeting decided:

- (a) For the time being not to modify section 2.3.5 as proposed in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/56/Add.2;
- (b) Not to introduce a new section 2.3.6, which would enable industry to begin to classify its products in accordance with the criteria of the GHS pending the effective implementation of these criteria;
- (c) To introduce into RID/ADR/ADN provisions similar to those of the M80 multilateral agreement, which would permit derogations from the existing criteria of RID/ADR/ADN by referring to already-published lists of substances pollutant to the aquatic environment for the classification of these products (see annex 1).

28. It would subsequently be necessary to return to these questions when the issue of substances pollutant to the aquatic environment was discussed *in extenso* by the United Nations Committee of Experts.

Part 3

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/56/Add.3

UN Nos. 3077 and 3082 and special provision 179

29. The Joint Meeting decided that, rather than introduce a special provision 179 which would be different from that of the United Nations Model Regulations (see document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/56, para. 38), it would add a new paragraph 2.1.3.9 to indicate that wastes that did not meet the criteria of Classes 1 to 9 but were subject to the Basel Convention could be carried under UN Nos. 3077 to 3082 (see annex 1).

Special provision PP85

30. The Joint Meeting decided not to include this special packing provision from the United Nations Model Regulations (concerning UN Nos. 1948, 2208 and 2880, under packing instruction P002) because it concerned the load and not the packaging and duplicated special provision CV/CW 35.

UN No. 3461

31. The Joint Meeting noted that although UN No. 3461 (aluminium alkyl halides, solid) concerned solids, only tank code L21DH was attributed to it because these substances were not in powdery or granular form and could only therefore be presented for carriage in tanks in the molten state.

Infectious substances in tanks

32. With reference to paragraphs 32 and 33 of the report of the working group on harmonization, the Joint Meeting noted that certain substances, such as waste or blood from slaughter houses or blood intended for the preparation of pharmaceutical products, currently coming under UN Nos. 2814 and 2900, risk group 2, could be carried in tanks, but that this would not be possible in the future according to the new provisions for Class 6.2.

33. It seemed logical that category A substances assigned to UN Nos. 2814 and 2900 should not be authorized for carriage in tanks, although a number of delegations considered that it should be possible to carry category B substances in tanks. No UN number (2814, 2900, 3291 or 3373), however, was appropriate for this type of carriage, and UN No. 3373 was the only number which could conceivably be used, even though the description "CLINICAL SPECIMENS" or "DIAGNOSTIC SPECIMENS" was not appropriate.

34. The Joint Meeting agreed that it would not be desirable to create a special RID/ADR/ADN entry for this special case and that it would be preferable for a proposal in this regard to be made to the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts. Similarly, neither the United Nations Model Regulations nor the existing RID/ADR made provision for the bulk carriage of category B substances, with the exception of those classified under UN No. 3291, and it would not be appropriate to introduce provisions for this purpose without a proposal in writing.

35. It was suggested that a special provision of Chapter 3.3 of RID/ADR/ADN could be introduced to extend the scope of UN No. 3373 for the carriage of certain category B substances in tanks, together with a TU special provision explaining clearly which substances it was permitted to carry in tanks. This suggestion was entrusted to a drafting group.

Part 4

Packagings for lighters

Documents: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/9 (Norway)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2002/20 (Norway)

36. The Joint Meeting decided to bring RID/ADR/ADN into line with United Nations Model Regulations, by replacing packing instruction P205 by instruction P002 in conjunction with special provision PP84 and special provision 201 in Chapter 3.3. It decided, however, to introduce a derogation for packagings of less than 10 kg by means of a special provision RID/ADR/ADN RR4 (see annex 1).

37. The representative of Austria pointed out that this was not an exemption from the application of provisions concerning transport documentation, and that sending these lighters by post was consequently not permitted; this was confirmed by the Chairman.

Section 4.1.6

Informal documents: INF.35 and INF.58 (EIGA)

38. After a drafting group had considered EIGA's proposal, the Joint Meeting agreed to certain amendments to section 4.1.6 (see annex 1).

39. The Joint Meeting shared the opinion of Switzerland that NOTE 2 to 4.1.6.5 was unnecessary. The Joint Meeting did not agree that paragraph 4.1.6.10 should be brought fully into line with the corresponding paragraph in the United Nations Model Regulations. It considered that after expiry of the deadline for inspection, refillable gas cylinders could only be carried if they were being taken to a point of inspection or disposal with the possibility of intermediate transport operations (see annex 1).

Bulk containers

Informal documents: INF.6 and INF.6/Add.1 (United Kingdom) and INF.13 (Belgium)

40. The Joint Meeting approached this issue bearing in mind the discussion in the working group on harmonization (see document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/56, paras. 39 to 46). It would have to decide on the following three approaches:

(a) The approach by the United Kingdom in informal documents INF.6 and its Add.1, which, rather than a separate or parallel system, recommended a comprehensive system based on the new provisions of the Model Regulations and extended to all substances covered by RID and ADR. This would, inter alia, involve replacing most of the VV/VW codes and their provisions by the BK1 and BK2 codes which should appear in column (10) of Table A;

(b) The approach by Belgium presented in informal document INF.13 consisting in not including the new Chapter 6.11 (6.8 of the Model Regulations) but simply inserting a reference in Chapter 7.3 to Chapters 6.9 and 4.3 of the IMDG Code;

(c) The parallel approach by the UN/ECE secretariat as adopted by the working group on harmonization and reflected in documents TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/56/Add.6 and TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/56/Add.7, which constituted a compromise between these two approaches, namely, to keep the existing system while leaving open the possibility of using the new system of the United Nations Model Regulations.

41. On the basis of a voting procedure proposed by the Chairman, the Joint Meeting did not agree to delete the VV/VW provisions of Chapter 7.3; it therefore rejected the United Kingdom's approach. In a second vote, it adopted the inclusion of Chapters 6.11 and 7.3 as contained in documents TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/56/Add.6 and -/Add.7 and the pertinent new definitions of 1.2.1 (document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/56/Add.1).

42. With reference to the approval of bulk containers by the competent authority, it was noted that the implementation of Chapter 6.11 and thus the approval of BK bulk containers was necessary only if use was made of the parallel system of the United Nations Model Regulations in accordance with 7.3.1.1 (a) and 7.3.2. It was proposed that the loading compartments of vehicles/wagons should be excluded from this approval requirement, but this proposal was not adopted.

43. It was pointed out that section 6.11.4 did not contain true technical provisions and that, as a result, it would be difficult to issue approvals on the basis of very vague general requirements. It was, however, decided to maintain this section, and it would be for each country to determine on what basis such approvals could be issued.

44. The representative of UIC pointed out that existing provisions were sometimes obsolescent and illogical. It would therefore be useful in a second stage to rationalize the provisions concerning carriage in bulk as had been done for tanks.

Parts 4 to 7

Documents: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/56 and Add.4-7

Informal document: INF.30

45. Following the discussion on bulk containers, the Joint Meeting decided to entrust consideration of the remaining documents concerning harmonization to a drafting group, whose conclusions, as set out in informal document INF.30, were adopted with some amendments for special provision TU concerning the carriage of infectious substances in tanks (see annex 1).

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/57 (Norway)

46. After discussion of the proposal by Norway, it was agreed during the first part of the session that the introduction of provisions in Chapters 4.3 and 6.8 for the carriage of ammonium nitrate emulsions (UN No. 3375) in RID/ADR tanks required further reflection at the expert level, for example, for the capacity of pressure-relief systems, the hierarchy of tanks, etc. ... The part of the proposal concerning RID/ADR tanks was therefore entrusted to the working group on tanks for consideration during the second part of the session (see paragraph 156, point 12).

47. Several delegations said that they did not wish this substance to be authorized for carriage by rail in tanks.

48. The carriage in portable tanks of UN Nos. 0331, 0332 and 3375 required the provisions of the United Nations Model Regulations to be reflected. If the working group on tanks had comments to make on these, they should be transmitted to the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts since the Joint Meeting was not competent to amend these provisions.

PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENTS TO RID/ADR/ADN

Definition of packing groups for substances of Class 3

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/38 (CEFIC)

49. This proposal to bring the definition into line with the United Nations Model Regulations was adopted with some amendments (see annex 1).

Carriage of receptacles for hot air balloons

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/11 (United Kingdom)

Informal documents: INF.14 (Commercial Balloon Operators of Europe)
INF.51 (Invitation, working group)
INF.60 (Report of the working group)

50. The Joint Meeting noted that there was a problem with the gas receptacles currently on the market for hot air balloons because there were few manufacturers and also because these receptacles had to be carried but were not constructed in accordance with the requirements of RID/ADR/ADN. For that reason, their carriage was not permitted and they could not therefore benefit from transitional measures; the only means of settling the problem lay for the time being with the multilateral agreements providing for derogations.

51. Several delegations were in favour of including special provisions in RID/ADR/ADN for these receptacles, but the United Kingdom's proposal seemed too succinct and was not supported by technical data concerning the construction of such receptacles.

52. On the proposal of the representative of Germany, the Joint Meeting agreed that the drafting of appropriate provisions should be handled by a working group, which should have access to all the technical data. Before the new provisions entered into force, the carriage of existing receptacles could be effected under cover of a new multilateral agreement which would replace the M90 agreement when it expired and whose text could also be drafted by the working group.

53. The working group met during the second part of the session (see INF.51) and concluded that the problem essentially affected road transport. It would continue to work by correspondence and a proposal for the amendment of ADR would be submitted to the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods at its January 2004 session (see INF.60).

Carriage of paint residues

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/23 (Netherlands)

Informal document: INF.32 (Report of the ad hoc working group)

54. The proposal to regulate the carriage of paint residues in a safe and practical way was favourably received by the Joint Meeting. An ad hoc working group was entrusted with settling the problems raised, in particular the problems of classification (Class 3 or 4.1) and packaging (flexible IBCs and/or large packagings).

55. On the basis of the drafting group's report, the Joint Meeting decided that paint residues should be classified in Class 3 (UN No. 1263) and that they could be carried in flexible IBCs only with an additional protection in the form of an overpack with complete walls (see annex 1).

Chapter 3.3, special provision 640

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/32 (UIC)

Informal document: INF.3 (CEPE)

56. The representative of UIC explained that the aim of his document was to make the text of special provision 640 easier to understand in order to improve the safety of carriage in tanks. In document INF.3 CEPE supported this move towards simplification which limited the scope of the special provision to carriage in RID/ADR tanks only.

57. The Chairman recalled that the annexes of the European Directive on roadside checks were going to be modified and that the immobilization of vehicles was to be expected in the event of breaches if information for checking purposes was inadequate. The information provided by special provision 640 was therefore important.

58. It was further pointed out that this provision also concerned packagings and IBCs. In the context of the working group on the harmonization of particulars in the transport document, however, it had emerged that such provisions were undesirable in multimodal transport.

59. The Joint Meeting finally adopted this proposal.

Transport of used lithium cells and batteries

Documents: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/37 (France)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/25 (Germany)

Informal documents: INF.28 (France) and INF.28/Rev.1 (France)

60. The representative of France specified that her proposal concerned the carriage of used lithium cells and batteries from collection centres (sales points) to assembly points, since the provisions of instruction P903a and special provision 636 for used lithium cells were not suitable enough for this type of carriage according to the pertinent European Directive. She explained that document INF.28 was an adaptation of multilateral agreement M126.

61. This proposal was favourably received on a first reading but amendments proved to be necessary.

62. The representative of Germany said that if this proposal were adopted he would withdraw his document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/25.

63. A new consolidated text submitted by the representative of France in informal document INF.28/Rev.1 was adopted during the first part of the session; the “40 g” gross mass was provisionally placed in square brackets for a decision during the second part of the session.

64. During the second part of the session the Joint Meeting noted that the problem of collecting used cells could in practice concern lithium cells weighing up to 450 g, for example, for laptop computers. It finally agreed to increase the limit from 40 to 250 g (see annex 1).

65. At the request of the representative of Switzerland, the representative of France said that he would initiate a new multilateral agreement in order to permit the implementation of the new provisions as rapidly as possible.

Limited quantities

Documents: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/16 (France and United Kingdom)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2002/6 (Switzerland)

66. The proposal by France and the United Kingdom recommended the adoption of the proposal by Switzerland set out in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2002/6 with an amendment. It was suggested that the results of the ongoing work of harmonization in the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts could be waited for, but it was pointed out that the aim of harmonization could not be achieved before 2007.

67. An ad hoc working group met and proposed further amendments to document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2002/6. The Joint Meeting finally adopted these two documents with the proposed amendments.

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/14 (United Kingdom)

68. This document was the revision of an earlier proposal concerning aerosols and gas cartridges in limited quantities, the principle of which had been approved by the Joint Meeting of September 2002. Drafting amendments were made to the texts and the Joint Meeting approved the transfer of the provisions relating to internal pressure, filling and the leakproofness test of instruction P204 in Chapter 6.2 (see annex 1).

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/10 (CEPE and AISE)

69. This proposal to harmonize limited quantities for UN No. 3082 was adopted.

Informal document: INF.12: Report of the ad hoc working group on limited quantities of the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts (Paris, 23-27 June 2003)

70. The Joint Meeting had before it the report introduced by the Chairman who recalled that the question at issue was the harmonization of the different systems in force: limited quantities of the Model Regulations and RID/ADR, consumer commodities of the IMDG Code and excepted quantities of the ICAO Technical Instructions.

71. The representatives of UIC and the Netherlands considered that information should be required in the transport document for multimodal transport and the representatives of Belgium and Germany expressed a wish for the study submitted by France on the risk plan also to be taken into account. Delegates were requested to submit any comments or reflections as informal documents for the October meeting or directly to the Chairman.

Carriage of radioactive material

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/35 (Secretariat)

72. The proposals by the secretariat for alignment with the IAEA Regulations and with regard to clarifications were adopted with some amendments (see annex 1).

73. The question of the deletion of code 70 in column (20) of RID for the carriage of radioactive material in excepted packages was referred to the RID Committee of Experts. It was pointed out in this context that according to 2.2.7.9.1, the provisions of Chapter 5.3 were not applicable to excepted packages.

New types of LPG cylinders

Document: TRANS/WP.15/C.1/2003/6 (AEGPL)

Informal documents: INF.22 (AEPGL)
INF.31 (Drafting group)

74. The Joint Meeting noted that the industry had brought on the market LPG cylinders of less than 15 litres which complied with RID/ADR requirements as far as their design and construction were concerned; their periodic inspection, however, would give rise to problems.

On account of their design they could not be subjected to the periodic inspections for each cylinder for which RID/ADR provided, which would irrevocably damage the cylinder. It was therefore proposed to carry out these inspections on a statistical basis.

75. Several delegations said that they were not in favour of introducing a general clause whereby these cylinders could undergo inspections other than those for which RID/ADR provided with the agreement of the competent authorities of the countries concerned; derogations of this type came under multilateral agreements. They would prefer that the conditions for inspections should be specified and included in RID/ADR after they had been considered and adopted by the Joint Meeting. Several of these delegations were not in favour of inspections on a statistical basis, since each gas cylinder should normally undergo a periodic inspection.

76. The representative of AEGPL said that he would prepare a new proposal.

Interval between two periodic inspections for LPG cylinders

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/7 (AEGPL)

Informal document: INF.23 (AEGPL)

77. Several delegations were not in favour of increasing the interval between periodic inspections from 10 to 15 years for LPG steel cylinders which were inspected in accordance with the standard EN 14440:1996.

78. It was pointed out that before being introduced into RID/ADR, a provision of that nature had to be considered by the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts.

79. The representative of AEGPL said that he would prepare a new proposal.

Labelling of cylinders for liquefied petroleum gases (LPG)

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/28 (AEGPL)

80. The proposal to amend 5.2.2.2.1.6 (c) was adopted but only for the liquefied petroleum gases most commonly commercialized, namely, UN Nos. 1011, 1075, 1965 and 1978 (see annex 1).

Cleaning certificate for empty tanks

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/4 (Liechtenstein)

81. Several delegations considered that the text proposed by Liechtenstein was superfluous since empty uncleaned tanks were not subject to RID/ADR and it would not therefore be legally correct to apply RID/ADR requirements to them. It was also pointed out that the problem raised was more a question of checks and that discussions on conditions for the issue of cleaning certificates were in progress in several countries and in CEFIC.

Dimensions of the orange-coloured plates

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2002/8 (Liechtenstein)

82. Overall, the Joint Meeting was of the opinion that the problem raised concerned too restrictive an interpretation of the texts rather than the clarity of the provisions relating to the dimensions of the orange-coloured plates. It was acknowledged, however, that misinterpretations by inspectors had serious economic consequences, particularly when vehicles were immobilized unnecessarily.

83. In order to avoid these problems, the Joint Meeting decided to establish standardized dimensions for the orange-coloured plates with a leeway of approximately 10% (see annex 1).

84. It was pointed out that the solution adopted could have adverse effects insofar as these new provisions were more stringent than before and were therefore liable to put carriers in breach of the regulations. It would therefore be advisable to make provision for transitional measures.

85. With reference to the problem of small plates being damaged when vehicles of less than 3.5 tonnes were washed, the Joint Meeting was of the opinion that this was purely a matter for the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods to which the document should be transmitted.

Paragraph 5.4.1.1.1 (c)

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/24 (Germany)

86. The proposed amendment to 5.4.1.1.1 (c) was adopted (see annex 1).

Chemical compatibility

Documents: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/20 and Add.1-2 (Germany)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/45 (Netherlands)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/46 (United Kingdom)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/47 (Germany)

Informal document: INF.55 (Drafting group)

87. The Meeting agreed in principle that new provisions on chemical compatibility should be introduced into RID/ADR/ADN, and that these provisions should be applicable to packagings and to IBCs.

88. The text proposed in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/20, as amended by documents TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/47 and the informal document prepared by a drafting group (INF.55), was adopted (see annex 1).

89. Referring to the list of standard substances and liquids, a member of the secretariat pointed out that it had several inconvenient features:

(a) A large number of isomers were listed under the same UN number while standard liquids were the same; if the isomers were removed, the list could be considerably shortened;

(b) Some substances not listed in RID/ADR/ADN were classified with a packing group under n.o.s. entries. To introduce the list into RID/ADR/ADN to indicate the standard liquids would be tantamount to making their classification official and could lead to errors in the classification of substances which did not have exactly the same properties.

90. The representatives of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands said that these problems would have been avoided if, instead of the introduction of the list, reference had been made to a standard. It was, however, pointed out that a standard of this type was not available for the time being.

91. The Joint Meeting agreed that the list could be introduced into RID/ADR/ADN provided that the problems mentioned by the secretariat were eliminated. It requested the representative of Germany to prepare a new list and to submit it to the secretariat bearing in mind the comments it had made.

Information concerning empty means of containment

Documents: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/17 (Austria)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/27 (UIC)

92. Austria's first proposal concerning 5.4.1.1.1 (e) was not adopted.

93. Austria's second proposal to specify in 5.4.1.1.1 (f) of ADR that the total quantity of dangerous goods should not be given in the transport document in the case of empty uncleaned means of containment, was adopted.

94. The opinion of the representative of the Netherlands was that 5.4.1.1.1 was not applicable to empty uncleaned means of containment, unless this was specifically mentioned in 5.4.1.1.6. Consequently, to insert the phrase "with the exception of empty means of containment, uncleaned" in 5.4.1.1.1 (f) could lead to the erroneous interpretation that, on the contrary, paragraphs 5.4.1.1.1 (a) to (e) and (g) to (i) were applicable to these empty uncleaned means of containment.

95. Austria's third proposal was not supported by any delegation; there was therefore no need to give details of the previous contents in the case of empty uncleaned packagings, IBCs or large packagings, in accordance with the existing situation.

96. The Joint Meeting adopted amendments to 5.4.1.1.6 on the basis of a revised version of the UIC document distributed during the session (see annex 1).

Provision V/W7

Documents: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/2 (Norway)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/51 (EIGA)

Informal document: INF.57/Rev.1 (EIGA)

97. After discussing the proposals submitted, the Joint Meeting adopted a new loading provision whereby if gases were loaded in closed unventilated vehicles, wagons or containers, the doors of the loading compartments should carry an appropriate marking (see annex 1). Special provision V7 was deleted for gases and provision W7 for UN No. 3374. The Joint Meeting did not agree to the requirement of a placard for the vehicles.

Reports of the working group on the transport document

Informal documents: INF.11 (OCTI) and INF.38 (Germany)

98. The representative of Germany briefly introduced the reports of the working group which had met in Hamburg on 10 and 11 June 2003 and in Frankfurt on 22 and 23 September 2003, and in particular the conclusions derived from a comparison between the provisions of RID, ADR, the IMDG Code, the ICAO Technical Instructions and the United Nations Model Regulations concerning documentation.

99. The Joint Meeting was in principle in favour of including the date in the transport document (INF.11, para. 17) but did not see any need to prescribe the indication of the number of pages (INF.11, para. 21).

100. Since there was not enough time to examine these conclusions and specific proposals for amendment, the Joint Meeting considered that the working group should continue its work and submit a further report and proposals for amendment on the basis of its conclusions. The comparison of the various instruments should be based on the thirteenth revised edition of the United Nations Model Regulations and the 2005 versions of RID, ADR, the IMDG Code and ICAO Technical Instructions.

101. The representative of Germany said that many proposals were specific to RID or ADR and that certain proposals should therefore be submitted directly to WP.15 and RID.

SECURITY IN THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS

Documents: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/92/Add.2-OCTI/RID/GT-III/2003-A/Add.2
(Report of the last session)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/49 (Belgium)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/58 (Belgium)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/61 (Portugal)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/64 (Austria)

Informal documents: INF.9 (Portugal)
INF.10 and INF.10/Rev.1 (EIGA)
INF.19 (EFMA)
INF.20 (Netherlands)
INF.26 (Switzerland)
INF.40 (Secretariat)
INF.48 (United Kingdom)

102. In view of the decisions taken at the last session (TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/92-OCTI/RID/GT-III/2003-A, paras. 83 and 91), it was decided to review the texts in square brackets in annex 2 of the report of the last session in the light of the various proposals put forward.

103. The Joint Meeting considered that the new chapter on security should be numbered 1.10 in RID, ADR and ADN, while Chapter 1.10 and the following chapters of RID and ADN should be renumbered accordingly (see annex 1).

NOTE 1

104. It was decided to delete this NOTE. The understanding was that, in view of article 4, paragraph 1 of ADR, Contracting Parties could, for reasons of security, notwithstanding the provisions of this new chapter, regulate differently or prohibit the entry of dangerous goods into their territory.

NOTE 2

105. The scope of this NOTE was extended to dangerous goods which might constitute a hazard for the environment.

1.X.1.1

106. The proposed amendment by Austria contained in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/64 was put to the vote but was not adopted, while that of Belgium in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/49 was adopted (see annex 1).

1.X.1.2

107. When this paragraph was discussed, the representative of Spain announced that he would abstain from all votes on motions concerning this new chapter.

108. As proposed by Austria, it was decided that the provision in 1.X.1.2 would be put in the passive form so as to avoid the reference to the consignor (see annex 1).

109. The proposal by Portugal that the carrier should be identified in the transport document was not adopted.

110. The proposal by Belgium that the identification of the transport unit and of the vehicle crew should be required was not adopted.

1.X.1.3

111. After a lengthy discussion based on the proposals contained in documents TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/64, TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/61 and INF.9, the Joint Meeting finally adopted a compromise text drafted by a small ad hoc working group (see annex 1).

1.X.1.5

112. The Joint Meeting did not support the proposal by Belgium in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/49 to delete this paragraph and consequently to make an addition to the heading of Chapter 1.8, particularly as a reference to 1.X.1.5 had already been taken into account in 1.8.1.1.

1.X.1.6

113. Consideration of the new paragraph proposed by Portugal in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/61 was referred back to the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods since it concerned ADR only.

1.X.2.1 to 1.X.2.4

114. The proposal by Belgium in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/49 to delete paragraphs 1.X.2.3 and 1.X.2.4 as redundant in view of paragraphs 1.3.1 and 1.3.3 was adopted. In order to take account of these deletions and in view of the fact that the retraining referred to in 1.X.2.3 did not have the same scope as that for which 1.3.3 provided (bearing in mind the changes in the regulations), paragraph 1.4.2.1 was reworded on the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom (see annex 1).

1.X.3.1

115. Several delegations were not in favour of the mandatory introduction of a programme for identifying consignors, carriers or other participants engaged in the carriage of high consequence dangerous goods since this measure did not seem to them to be compatible with their domestic legislation. Some delegations would have liked a study of legal practices or possibilities in the different countries which were Contracting Parties to RID or ADR.

116. A vote was taken on this provision of the United Nations Recommendations, but it was not adopted. Since this was a security and not a safety problem, each country maintained its prerogative of ensuring individually the implementation of this provision in its domestic legislation if it so wished.

117. In order to keep the numbering in parallel with the United Nations Model Regulations, the text of the introduction to Table 1.X.1 and the last sentence of 1.X.3.1 were put together in paragraph 1.10.3.1, with some changes (see annex 1). It was agreed that the list in Table 1.10.1 was the full list of high consequence dangerous goods and not merely an indicative list.

118. A vote was taken on the proposed amendments by Portugal (TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/61) to the introductory sentence of Table 1.X.1, transferred to 1.X.3, but they were not adopted.

Exemptions to Table 1.X.1 (1.10.1)

119. The Joint Meeting did not agree to delete ammonium nitrate fertilizers from the list as proposed by EFMA in informal document INF.9 and Belgium in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/49.

120. During consideration of informal document INF.10/Rev.1 (EIGA), which proposed the addition of section 1.10.3 to follow Chapter 5.3 in the list of exemptions of 1.1.3.6.2 for toxic gases with a CL_{50} 1h of 200 ppm or above, the representative of Italy proposed orally a move to extend the scope of the exemptions to the substances referred to in paragraphs 1.1.3.6.3 and 2.2.7.1.2 and Chapters 3.3 and 3.4, i.e. the provisions exempting companies from having a safety adviser in accordance with 1.8.3.2.6. The proposed exemption referred to sections 1.10.3.1 to 1.10.3.3.

121. This proposal was finally adopted during the first part of the session (see annex 1) in the form of a new paragraph 1.10.4. The representative of Sweden entered a reservation on the exemption of highly toxic gases from transport category 1.

122. During the second part of the session, the secretariat proposed drafting changes (INF.40) to the texts adopted in order to take better account of the systems specific to RID, ADR and ADN. These amendments were adopted, with the exception of the addition of a NOTE under the heading of Chapter 1.10 which was not considered necessary.

123. The representative of the United Kingdom in informal document INF.48 proposed that all dangerous goods should be subject to the general security provisions of 1.10.1 and 1.10.2. He also proposed that certain substances in the list of high consequence dangerous goods, when carried below the thresholds of 1.1.3.6, could be exempted from the provisions of 1.10.3, with the exception of certain toxic by inhalation liquids, toxic gases and explosives which came under transport category 1.

124. Several delegations considered that some of the substances to which the United Kingdom's proposal referred were particularly hazardous and that it should be checked whether they should not be included in transport category 0 in order to ensure consistency between security and safety requirements. It did not seem possible, however, to reopen the discussion on assignment to transport categories at the current session without an official proposal.

125. In response to a question from the Chairman, the Joint Meeting decided by a large majority that conditions should not be established for exemption in respect of security different from those applicable to safety. The United Kingdom's proposal, as it stood, thus became inappropriate.

126. The Joint Meeting did not agree to delete flammable gases and flammable liquids of packing group II from the list as proposed by Belgium in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/49.

Informal document INF.26 (Switzerland)

127. In view of the fact that this proposal concerned Chapters 8.4 and 8.5 of ADR and not RID, the Government of Switzerland would submit a specific proposal to the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods.

1.X.3.2 Security plans

1.X.3.2.2

128. The amendment proposed by Belgium under (b) in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/49 was adopted.

129. The addition proposed by Portugal under (c) in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/61 was not retained.

130. With reference to the question raised by Belgium in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/58, concerning the assessment of security risks in (c), the representative of UIC said that it was absolutely indispensable to have European guidelines like those in the United States of America, to ensure standardization in this area. He added that, as things stood, the railways were not in a position to meet that obligation.

131. The representative of the United Kingdom said that representatives of the UIC “security” group would be going to the United States of America in the near future. They would discuss security issues, including security in relation to dangerous goods, in order to contribute to the development of guidelines in the European context.

132. The Joint Meeting accepted a compromise between the basic text and the text proposed by Belgium for (d) of document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/49 (see annex 1), once the representative of Portugal had withdrawn his proposal in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/61 in favour of the proposal by Belgium.

133. During the very long discussion on the proposals for the amendment of paragraphs (g) and (h) (documents TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/49 and TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/64), it emerged that the basic text needed to be improved in order to be clearer and more accurate, in particular so that the legal conflict between security and safety provisions could be settled. The compromise text drafted by an ad hoc working group was finally adopted by the Joint Meeting (see annex 1).

134. The representative of Portugal withdrew his proposal (document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/61) to transform the NOTE at the end of 1.X.3.2.2 into a new paragraph 1.X.3.4 in order to make it binding, since the basic text of the Model Regulations had already been the subject of a compromise which there was no reason to call in question.

1.X.3.3

135. The amendments proposed in documents TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/49 and TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/64 referring in particular to the deletion of this paragraph also gave rise to a lengthy discussion in view of the legal questions raised by the basic text. A compromise

solution was ultimately reached consisting in the transformation of the paragraph into a non-binding NOTE, placed after 1.X.3.4 (renumbered 1.10.3.3) (see annex 1), since it did not concern security plans.

1.X.3.4

136. On the basis of document INF.20 from the Netherlands, the Joint Meeting made some drafting changes to this paragraph which was renumbered 1.10.3.3; a sentence was added, specifying that the implementation of measures of protection should not jeopardize emergency response activities (see annex 1).

1.8.3.3

137. On the basis of the proposal by Belgium in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/49, it was decided to include a reference to the security plan in the duties of the safety adviser in 1.8.3.3 (see annex 1).

SAFETY ADVISER

Documents: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/15 (Serbia and Montenegro)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/69 (IRU)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/26 (IRU)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/15 (Serbia and Montenegro)

Informal document: INF.50 (France)

138. The proposals put forward by the informal working group on safety advisers which had met in Geneva at the invitation of IRU from 9 to 11 July 2003 (TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/69) were put to the vote and the following decisions were taken:

(a) The proposal in paragraph 7 to make renewal of the certificate (para. 1.8.3.16.1) subject solely to passing an examination was adopted by a very large majority (see annex 1);

(b) The proposal contained in new paragraph 1.8.3.16.2 was also adopted by a very large majority (see annex 1).

139. It was pointed out that this decision could give rise to problems of interpretation for domestic and intra-Community traffic in European Union countries in that Directive 96/35/EC provided for the possibility of renewal on the basis either of an examination or of training.

140. The representative of Belgium asked whether it would be possible to amend the European Directive to take account of the Joint Meeting's decision.

141. The representative of the European Commission said that the Directive could be amended or annulled if it were absolutely necessary, but that in his opinion there was no incompatibility between the Directive and the decision taken in that it was for member States to decide which option to apply. Since member States also had to apply RID and ADR framework directives, which would reflect the Joint Meeting's decision, they would no longer have to choose between two options.

142. The representative of Germany considered that it would be possible in accordance with 1.8.3.17 to apply the 96/35/EC Directive instead of the RID and ADR framework directives, and that European Union member States would consequently keep their prerogative of a choice between the “examination” or the “training” options.

143. The representative of the European Commission said that he would seek the opinion of the Commission’s legal service on these questions of interpretation.

144. It was then suggested that paragraph 1.8.3.17 should be deleted, since the conditions of the European Directive no longer corresponded to those of RID and ADR.

145. The representative of Germany considered that the deletion of the paragraph could in practice have serious consequences for safety advisers whose certificate was issued on the basis of the Directive.

146. The Chairman said that the problem could easily be solved by means of a transitional measure such as that proposed by France in informal document INF.50.

147. The representatives of Belgium and the Czech Republic entered reservations regarding the proposal to delete the paragraph in question. If it were to prove later that, in legal terms, the coexistence of different provisions in the 96/35/EC Directive and the RID and ADR framework directives allowed member States to choose between the two options, this possibility should also be offered to non-European Union States which were Contracting Parties to ADR or member States of COTIF. Paragraph 1.8.13.7 would allow them the choice.

148. The representative of Sweden pointed out that paragraph 1.8.3.17 referred to the “relevant” conditions of the European Directive and that, in view of the decision taken, the option of renewing the certificate on the basis of training alone was no longer relevant.

149. After lengthy discussion it was considered that the problem could not be completely satisfactorily settled in the Joint Meeting. Since it was a matter of the interpretation of two European directives which overlapped and contained divergences, it should be settled by the European Union, bearing in mind the Joint Meeting’s opinion that the renewal of certificates for safety advisers in the future should be solely on the basis of an examination. In order to avoid problems of this type in future, either Directive 96/35/EC and related directives should be systematically amended each time that the corresponding provisions of RID and ADR were amended or rail and road transport should be excluded from the scope of this Directive.

150. The Joint Meeting considered that there was no need to make provision for special transitional measures for these new provisions since they were not applicable retroactively. Accordingly, all certificates issued or renewed before 1 July 2005 on the basis of the current provisions would remain valid for five years.

151. The proposal by France in informal document INF.50 to authorize the competent authority to extend the validity of certificates issued before 31 December 2000 by six months so as to enable each country to adapt to the renewal procedures for the large numbers of first certificates issued three years ago was not adopted.

152. The Joint Meeting accepted the offer by France to organize an exchange forum to discuss harmonization of the levels of difficulty of the examinations.

STANDARDS

Informal documents: INF.7 (UIC)
INF.37 (Finland), INF.39 (CEN),
INF.56 (Report of the working group)

153. The Joint Meeting adopted proposals 1 and 2 of informal document INF.56 drafted by the working group which had met concurrently from 13 to 15 October subject to:

- (a) Drafting changes to the presentation;
- (b) A discussion in greater depth on the reference to standard EN 14025 in the context of the discussion of the report of the working group on tanks;
- (c) The availability of the standards before the deadlines for the notification of amendments to RID (31 January 2004).

TANKS

Documents: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/43 (Italy)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/50 (Belgium)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/52 and 53 (Switzerland)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/57 (Secretariat)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/65 (United Kingdom)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/66 (France)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/67 and 68 (UIP)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/72 (OCTI)

Informal documents: INF.7 and INF.8 (UIC), INF.15, INF.16, INF.17 and INF.18 (Netherlands), INF.34 (France), INF.36 (Norway), INF.44 and INF.45 (Belgium), INF.46 (Netherlands), INF.59 (Report of the working group)

154. Following a brief introduction by their authors in plenary, the documents were handed over to a working group chaired by Mr. Ludwig (Germany) which met concurrently from 13 to 15 October.

155. On the basis of the various points in the report of the working group, the Joint Meeting decided the following:

Point 1: “Maximum allowed working pressure” should be replaced by “maximum working pressure” in 6.10.3.6 and 6.10.3.8 of ADR in accordance with the definition in 1.2.1 of RID (see annex 1);

Point 2: The problem raised by Finland (INF.37) in relation to standard 14025 was settled by an addition to the definition of maximum working pressure in 1.2.1 (see annex 1). Reference could therefore be made to standard 14025;

Point 3: The amendment to 6.8.2.7 concerning the reference to standard EN 12972 according to informal document INF.7 was adopted with an addition to ensure the same level of safety (see annex 1);

Point 4: The proposals for drafting changes to the definition of “hermetically closed tanks” were adopted with an addition for RID (see annex 1);

Point 5: The amendments concerning conditions of carriage for UN Nos. 1001, 1067 and 1076 were adopted (see annex 1);

Point 6: The amendment of the reference in 6.8.3.4.13 was adopted (see annex 1). It was noted that this was a correction;

Point 7: The bringing of 6.8.3.5.11 of ADR into line with RID for the marking of MEGCs was approved (see annex 1);

Point 8: The proposals for amendments to 4.3.4.1.2 and 4.3.4.1.3 were adopted (see annex 1);

Point 9: The Joint Meeting noted that the United Kingdom would submit a new proposal to replace document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/65;

Point 10: The amendments to 6.8.2.5.2 were adopted (see annex 1). At the request of the representative of UIC, the Joint Meeting confirmed that in the event of the use of tanks with more efficient characteristics according to the tank hierarchy, the codes of the applicable special provisions should also be marked on the tank;

Point 11: UIP was requested to review its document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/67 in the light of the comments made by the working group;

Point 12: The amendments concerning UN No. 3375 were adopted with an addition to 4.3.4.1.3 (d) (see annex 1). It would also be appropriate to review the multilateral agreement concerning this UN number, and possibly draft a proposal to amend the provisions for carriage in portable tanks of the United Nations Model Regulations;

Point 13: The Joint Meeting took note of the request by UIC, supported by the working group, to solve the problem raised in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/33, concerning the identification of substances which could be carried in United Nations MEGCs. It encouraged members to support UIC’s efforts in the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts;

Point 14: The proposal for the amendment of 6.10.3.9 was adopted with a further change (see annex 1), with the exception of the sentence concerning the minimum internal diameter of safety devices. The question of the minimum diameter was referred back to the working group for more detailed discussion;

Point 15: The amendments to 6.8.2.4.2 and 6.8.2.4.3 were adopted (see annex 1);

Point 16: The Joint Meeting adopted new wording for TE6 and confirmed that this provision also applied to non-pressurized tanks and that the letter “V” could be applied in the tank code (see annex 1);

Points 17 and 18: The amendments to the explanations in 3.2.1 for column (12) and the addition of the LGBV code for UN No. 3077 in Table A of Chapter 3.2 were adopted with some changes (see annex 1);

Point 19: The addition of a new provision TEXX for UN Nos. 3256 and 3257 was adopted (see annex 1).

156. The report of the working group is reproduced in annex 2 to this report, with the corrections made by the Joint Meeting to the texts proposed.

FUTURE WORK

157. In view of the transfer of the March 2004 session to October 2003, the Joint Meeting would have only a single week's session in 2004 (13 to 17 September 2004).

158. The programme of work for 2004-2005 would include the following:

- Questions pending;
- Harmonization with the United Nations Model Regulations;
- Harmonization of provisions concerning documentation;
- New proposals for amendments to RID/ADR/ADN;
- Standards;
- Tanks;
- Rationalized approach to the carriage of solids in bulk.

159. Delegations wishing to transform informal documents that had not been discussed into official documents were requested to submit them officially to the secretariats.

ELECTIONS

160. The Joint Meeting re-elected Mr. C. Pfauvadel (France) as Chairman and Mr. H. Rein (Germany) as Vice-Chairman for 2004.

MISCELLANEOUS

Tributes to Mr. Matley, Mr. Munkby and Mr. Stolz

161. Having learned that Mr. V. Matley, the former representative of the United Kingdom, had recently been transferred to another government ministry, and that the retirement of Mr. L. Munkby, the representative of Sweden, and of Mr. W. Stolz, the representative of Austria, was imminent, the Joint Meeting paid tribute to their much appreciated contribution to its work over the course of many years, and wished them every success in their new activities.

Questionnaire concerning the distribution of documents and the use of the web site of the UN/ECE Transport Division

Informal document: INF.25

162. Delegates were asked to fill out the questionnaire distributed at the request of the Bureau of the Inland Transport Committee.

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

163. The Joint Meeting adopted the report and its annexes on the basis of a draft prepared by the secretariat.

164. Annex 1 to this report contains a recapitulation of all the draft amendments to RID/ADR/ADN adopted in 2003, i.e. the texts adopted at the current session and those adopted at the spring 2003 session (see also TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/92/Add.2).
