

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

**INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE**

Joint Meeting of the RID Safety Committee and the  
Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods  
(Bern, 7-11 March 2005)

**HARMONISATION WITH THE UN RECOMMENDATIONS  
ON THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS**

**Belgian comments to document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2005/28**

With respect to document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2005/28 of the secretariat, Belgium stresses the following points :

1. In paragraph 3. of the document, it is stated that “*Harmonisation ... with the UN Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, Model Regulations, would require amendments as listed in the annex hereto ...*”. It should, however, not be forgotten that by doing so there will be no harmonisation:

- with the GHS criteria, and
- with the IMDG Code (the sea mode will – without any doubt - not take over the decisions of the Committee of experts of December 2005 with respect to the aquatic pollutants ; point 101 of the report of the TDG Subcommittee of December states in this respect : *The Sub-Committee considered that the decisions taken should not prevent IMO from requiring an identification of substances of Classes 1 to 8 by the GHS labelling or a designation of substances of Classes 1 to 9 as aquatic pollutants or marine pollutants in the transport document for the purposes of implementation of the MARPOL Convention.*”

Harmonisation with the UN Recommendations is not a goal in itself. The real purpose is to achieve harmonisation between the different modes of transport, which in this case can only be achieved by not following the UN Recommendations.

2. If the Joint Meeting nevertheless decides to harmonise with the UN Recommendations in this respect, it should not be done via sub-section 2.1.3.8 as proposed by the secretariat. The first sentence “*For the purposes of ADR, many substances ... are deemed, without additional labelling, as being environmentally hazardous*” would lead to much confusion, because it is not stipulated anywhere which of these substances are deemed to be environmentally hazardous and which not. In fact, the only way to know would be through the criteria of 2.3.5 ... would it not ?

3. The proposal to delete the last two paragraphs of 2.2.9.1.10 is fully unacceptable for the following reasons :

- these paragraphs were introduced only three months ago in RID/ADR with a large majority, and to our knowledge no new arguments appeared since that could change this decision ;
  - the discussion on this topic (the choice between a limitative and an open system for the classification of substances under UN-Nos 3077 and 3082) still has to take place in the UN-committee on TDG. The Belgian document UN/SCETDG/25/INF.88 that deals in its point 3 with this topic is still on the agenda for discussion during the next biennium.
-