



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2007/39  
19 June 2007

ENGLISH  
Original: FRENCH

---

**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

Geneva, 11-21 September 2007

Agenda item 6 (b)

**PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENTS TO RID/ADR/ADN\***

**New proposals**

**Section 5.3.1 - Repetition on carrying wagons/vehicles of  
placards that are not visible**

**Transmitted by the Government of Austria**

**SUMMARY**

<b><i>Executive summary:</i></b>	The possibility of replacing placards with labels leaves open the question of whether the latter must also be affixed to carrying wagons/vehicles if they are not visible from the outside.
<b><i>Action to be taken:</i></b>	Paragraphs 5.3.1.3.1 and 5.3.1.7.3 should be worded more clearly.
<b><i>Related documents:</i></b>	-

---

\* Circulated by the Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail (OTIF) under the symbol OTIF/RID/RC/2007/39.

## Introduction

1. Paragraph 5.3.1.3.1 provides that placards affixed to large containers/containers, MEGCs, tank-containers or portable tanks and that are not visible from outside the carrying wagons/vehicles must also be affixed to the carrying wagons/vehicles. According to 5.3.1.7.3, placards affixed to tank-containers/tanks with a capacity of not more than 3 m<sup>3</sup> and small containers (ADR only) may be replaced with labels conforming to 5.2.2.2. The question of what consequences this has for 5.3.1.3.1 remains open.
2. For labelling, RID generally treats small containers as packages, in accordance with the wording of Chapter 5.3 and the NOTE under section 5.2.2, so that the problem does not even arise, and a similar understanding of ADR 5.3.1.7.3, as it relates to small containers, is possible. Given the uniform wording in 5.3.1.7.3, this should equally hold true for tank-containers/tanks.
3. This solution is in line with the wording according to which placards are replaced with labels, in which case 5.3.1.7.1 becomes redundant. It is also easy to apply in practice, as only placards that appear as such have to be repeated. There is no need to first reinterpret the situation with respect to labels.
4. Given the merely formal difference (affixing of placards or labels) in a situation of equal danger, there are nonetheless some doubts as to whether this solution would produce the desired result. In the light of the sequencing of the requirements, it could be argued that first the use of placards should be required, and then, if necessary, their repetition; lastly, their replacement with labels could be authorized in the cases mentioned.
5. The Government of Austria is therefore suggesting that this problem be discussed, and is submitting two alternative proposals for the codification of the outcome.

## Proposal

### Variant 1 (no repetition)

6. Add the following NOTE at the end of 5.3.1.3.1:

“NOTE: This requirement is not applicable when the placards are replaced by labels in accordance with 5.3.1.7.3.”

### Variant 2 (repetition)

7. 5.3.1.7.3 should read as follows:

“**5.3.1.7.3** For tank-containers/tanks with a capacity of not more than 3 m<sup>3</sup> and for small containers (ADR only), the dimension of the placards may be reduced to 100 mm.”

-----