



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2007/16
28 December 2006

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

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

Bern, 26-30 March 2007
Item 5 of the provisional agenda

PROPOSALS OF AMENDMENTS TO RID/ADR/ADN */

Acceptance of labels with small deviations

Transmitted by the European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC)

Background

1. At the last Joint Meeting session in September 2006, CEFIC presented informal document INF.10 on the acceptance, in land transport, of labels according to the IMDG Code and ICAO TI despite the fact that these show minor deviations from the labels used in RID/ADR and the UN Model Regulations. The main differences that were identified concerned the different width of the vertical stripes in labels No. 4.1 and 9, the presentation of the “hand” in label No.8 and the presence of a horizontal line in label No.9. Another more recent example concerns the new label No. 5.2 where the UN Model Regulations, RID and ADR show a white line in the upper half of the label with the symbol in white, whereas the IMDG Code shows a black line.

*/ Circulated by the Intergovernmental Organization for International Carriage by Rail (OTIF) under the symbol OTIF/RID/RC/2007/16.

2. Chemical companies had reported that, because of these differences, remarks have been made and fines imposed by competent authorities during checks in land transport.

3. Although recognising the problem, the Joint Meeting did not accept the proposal but preferred to place a remark in the report stipulating that modifications related to “differences in the IMDG Code and the ICAO TI should not incur sanctions by the enforcement authorities”. The Meeting agreed however to consider the minor differences or deviations at a later date, on the basis of examples.

4. CEFIC is of the opinion that examples of these deviations have already been provided (see above) and that a reference in the official RID/ADR texts is still preferred to a mention in a report as it offers a legal basis in case of differences in interpretation.

Proposal

5. Two alternative options are being proposed based upon existing texts in transport regulations dealing with the same issue

Alternative 1

6. Based upon a similar text in 1.9.5.3.3 relating to the possible modification of signs and symbols in the new tunnel regulations for ADR 2007, CEFIC is proposing to add the following sentence to 5.2.2.2.1:

“Minor variations made in this respect are acceptable, provided that they do not alter the essential intent and characteristics of the labels, e.g. corresponding labels of other transport modes.”

Alternative 2

7. Based upon the Note in paragraph 7.2.2.3.1 of the IATA Dangerous Goods Regulations, CEFIC is proposing to add a Note to 5.2.2.2.1 using the same text

“Minor variations in the design of the symbols on labels or other differences such as the width of vertical lines on labels as shown in these regulations or in regulations of other modes, which do not affect the obvious meaning of the label are acceptable. For example the hand shown on the Class 8 label may be shown with or without shading, the extreme right and left vertical lines on the Class 4.1 and Class 9 label may extend to the edge of the label or there may be some white space at the edge, etc.”

Justification

8. In the electronic processing of orders, companies print labels, which preferably cover the information of all modes of transport as well as markings for use according to EU directives: this ensures a highly flexible system, independent from the subsequent transport mode used.
