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REPORT

I. ATTENDANCE

1. The Joint Meeting of the RID Committee of Experts and the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) was held in Geneva from 23 to 26 March 2009 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, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The European Commission was also represented. The following intergovernmental organization was represented: the Organization for Cooperation between Railways (OSJD). The following international non-governmental organizations were represented: European Aerosol Federation (FEA); European Association of Dangerous Goods Safety Advisers (EASA); European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC); European Committee for Standardization (CEN); European Cosmetic, Toiletry and Perfumery Association (COLIPA); European Cylinder Makers Association (ECMA); European Federation of Waste Management and Environmental Services (FEAD); European Industrial Gases Association (EIGA); European Liquefied Petroleum Gas Association (AEGPL); International Association for Soaps, Detergents and Maintenance Products (AISE); International Federation of Freight Forwarders Associations (FIATA); International Road Transport Union (IRU); International Union of Private Wagons (UIP); International Union of Railways (UIC); Liaison Committee of Coachwork and Trailer Builders (CLCCR).

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (agenda item 1)

2. The Joint Meeting adopted the agenda proposed by the secretariat in documents ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/113 and Add.1 (letter A 81-02/501.2009 from OTIF), as updated by informal document INF.2/Rev.1.

III. TANKS (agenda item 2)

Informal documents: INF.5 (Germany) (flame arrester requirements)
INF.17 (UIP) (6.8.4; special provision TT8)

3. As only informal documents were submitted under the agenda item in question, it was decided that it would not be discussed at the current session.

4. While no session of the Working Group on Tanks was scheduled in the annotated agenda, certain delegations said that in future they should be informed by the secretariat at least a few days in advance of the session if there were no plans for the Working Group on Tanks to meet in parallel.
IV. STANDARDS (agenda item 3)

A. Working Group on Standards

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2009/1 (CEN)
Informal document: INF.14 (CEN)

5. Consideration of the documents was entrusted to the Working Group on Standards.

Informal document: INF.42 (report of the Working Group)

6. The Joint Meeting adopted the report of the Working Group, and stipulated the following:

(a) Standard 14025:2008 was applicable also to tanks for gases, and should therefore have been referenced in respect of 6.8.3.1 (and not just 6.8.2.1) in the 2009 version of RID and ADR;

(b) The dates for the application of the type approvals and for their renewal should appear in column (4) of the tables in 6.8.2.6 and 6.2.4.1.1, as proposed in 2.4 and 2.5 of the report, and should be verified at the next session, together with all the other dates in column (4) appearing in document ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2009/3;

(c) The question regarding the reference to standard EN 15551 in RID (INF.42, para. 2.7) could be reviewed at the September 2009 session, or by the group on tanks and vehicles of the RID Committee of Experts.

B. Standard EN 15507:2008

Informal documents: INF.31 (Belgium)
INF.32 (European Plastic Converters (EuPC))

7. The Joint Meeting noted the proposal by EuPC to add a reference to standard 15507:2008 under paragraphs 6.1.5.2.5 and 6.5.6.3.4 as an acceptable standard for testing the chemical compatibility of polyethylene grades. Several delegations mentioned, however, that plastic packagings tested in accordance with that standard’s procedures had shown serious shortcomings in terms of safety, and said that the question should not be addressed until the next session.

8. It was decided that the question should be studied by an informal working group between sessions, which would meet on 10 June 2009 in Berlin, at the invitation of EuPC. Delegations opposing reference to the standard were requested to provide EuPC with a detailed report in writing on the problems encountered.

3 Mr. J. BRÜDER - International Confederation of Plastics Packaging Manufacturers - c/o IK Industrieverband Kunststoffverpackungen e.v., Kaiser-Friedrich-Promenade 43 - BAD HOMBURG - D-61348 - Germany - Tel. 00 49 6172 926676 - Fax: 00 49 6 172 926670 - e-mail: bruder@icpp.org.
C. Principle of referring to standards in RID and ADR

Informal document: INF.3 (UIP)

9. The principles governing cooperation with CEN in respect of reference to European standards were set out in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/100/Add.3.

10. Regarding errors in the standards, it was for the Working Group on Standards to ensure that the standards did not contain errors before including a reference to them in the regulations. If errors were still found, it would be necessary to amend RID and ADR, either by deleting the reference or by adding a new one referring to errata published by CEN. In the meantime it was possible to conclude multinational agreements, with a derogation for the obligation to apply the standard or parts thereof; that could be done for the application of certain parts of standard EN 14025 in respect of tank-wagons.

11. The Joint Meeting noted that certain standards mandatory under RID and ADR might indeed contain clauses unrelated to safety. Reference to such standards could, for reasons unrelated to safety, limit the kinds of material authorized for use. In the same way, it was for the Working Group on Standards to ensure that in RID/ADR reference was made only to the parts of standards that dealt with safety.

12. As for standards that were not cited while they might be as important as those that were, it was recalled that all delegations and non-governmental organizations were entitled to propose the inclusion of references to standards, and that such proposals were considered by the Working Group on Standards.

13. Lastly, in respect of the application of national standards, it was recalled that, for example in the case of tanks not designed, built or tested according to the referenced standards, the competent authorities must transmit to the ECE secretariat (for ADR) a list of the technical codes they recognized.

14. Concern was expressed about the proliferation of references in the standards. In some countries, that posed a legal problem, as such standards were not publicly accessible; they were expensive, and obtaining them was problematic. The problem affected both those who had to apply the regulations and those responsible for supervision, who generally did not have access to all such standards.

V. INTERPRETATION OF RID/ADR/ADN (agenda item 4)

A. Application of the general transitional measure in 1.6.1.1

Informal document: INF.11 (Spain)

15. The Joint Meeting noted that for rail transport, paragraph 5.4.1.1.12 required an entry in the transport document if during the six-month general transitional period the transport was carried out under the previous version of RID.
16. For road transport, WP.15 had already expressed an opinion on that question, in relation to the transition to the restructured ADR. It had recommended as flexible an approach as possible (TRANS/WP.15/163, para. 10).

17. The Joint Meeting considered, in particular for road transport, that the competent authorities should show flexibility and use common sense by accepting, for transport during the six-month transitional period, the combined application of the previous and the new versions of RID and ADR, provided their provisions were not interdependent. For example, consignors should be able to ship goods under the former regulations, without hindering the application by carriers of the new provisions, and vice-versa, as long as that was not detrimental to safety, and as long as such provisions were not interdependent.

B. Use of pressure receptacles for the transport of chlorosilanes

Informal document: INF.15 (CEFIC)

18. The Joint Meeting noted that the reference to pressure receptacles as a possible packaging had unintentionally been omitted from new instruction P010, which replaced instruction P001 for chlorosilanes. Paragraph 4.1.3.6.1 clearly stipulated that pressure receptacles were generally permitted in that case, but 4.1.3.7 required that they be mentioned in the packing instruction in order to be authorized.

19. The Joint Meeting noted that a proposal would be made to correct that oversight in the United Nations Model Regulations. It considered that a multilateral agreement on a derogation from 4.1.3.7 should be initiated by 1 July 2009 to allow the industry to continue to transport substances covered by instruction P010 in pressure receptacles, pending the necessary corrections to the regulations.

C. Exemptions under 1.1.3.1 (b)

Informal document: INF.19 (United Kingdom)

20. Several delegations agreed with the United Kingdom that the exemptions provided under 1.1.3.1 (b) could lead to abuse in the case of certain equipment with liquid - and gas - fuel tanks or other gas reservoirs.

21. The representative of the United Kingdom was asked to submit a proposal at the next session to settle the matter.

D. Interpretation of 1.1.3.1 (c)

Informal document: INF.23 (Austria)

22. The discussion revealed that 1.1.3.1 (c) was interpreted differently in the various countries. Some delegations, while conceding that the provisions of 1.1.3.1 were not very precise, considered that they were absolutely necessary, and that while it would be useful to improve them, it would be advisable to show caution before changing its scope.
23. The delegations were invited to make their interpretations known to the representative of Austria, who would perhaps prepare a proposal of an amendment if he considered it necessary in the light of the replies submitted.

E. Interpretation of 4.1.3.6
Informal document: INF.29 (Netherlands)

24. It was noted that 4.1.3.6, as currently worded, allowed the use of pressure receptacles built and approved in a country of manufacture other than the contracting parties to ADR, ADN or COTIF for the carriage of liquids and solids. Furthermore, for the interpretation of 4.1.3.6.1 (a), though it was unlikely that a pressure receptacle would be built in accordance with European standards in a country that was not a party to ADR, ADN or COTIF, Chapter 6.2 also covered UN pressure receptacles approved for RID/ADR/ADN carriage, for carriage not only of liquids and solids, but also gas, as set out in paragraph 4.1.1.16, even if they were approved in a country that was not a contracting party.

VI. HARMONIZATION WITH THE UNITED NATIONS MODEL REGULATIONS ON THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS (agenda item 5)

A. Special provision 274

25. The Joint Meeting adopted the CEFIC proposal to remove Special Provision 274 from UN entries 1851, 3248 and 3249 for medicines.

B. Worldwide multimodal harmonization
Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2009/9 (Secretariat)

Worldwide multimodal harmonization

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2009/9 (Secretariat)

26. The Joint Meeting took note of the request of the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods to provide feedback in order to improve global harmonization of national and international legal instruments.

27. It was recalled that in accordance with its terms of reference the Joint Meeting systematically reviewed any amendment to the Model Regulations so as to reflect it in RID/ADR/ADN. In some instances, however, such amendments were not detailed enough to be incorporated into legislation, as was the case for certain provisions relating to Class 6.2 and, in that event, the Joint Meeting provided feedback to the United Nations Sub-Committee. The Joint Meeting generally considered that RID/ADR/ADN were well harmonized with the United Nations Model Regulations and that the existing variations were well justified in the European land transport context without constituting an obstacle to international multimodal transport.
28. Several delegations welcomed the initiative taken by the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts to improve harmonization. Some considered in particular that there were variations in form, for example in part 2 relating to classification, which obliged countries to make a separate translation of the regulations for each mode of transport; that could be avoided if there were agreement on a single text for the parts of the regulations that applied to all modes of transport.

29. The CEFIC representative pointed out that professional non-governmental organizations were putting together proposals for the divergences that raised practical problems.

30. It was noted that a number of divergences stemmed from less stringent provisions in European land transport regulations, but that harmonization was not an end in itself and that provisions suitable for all modes and all countries should be accepted for multimodal transport as a basis of harmonization.

Informal document: INF.26 (United Kingdom)

31. The Joint Meeting welcomed the comparison of the IMDG Code, the ICAO Technical Instructions, RID/ADR and the regulations of the United States of America.

32. It was pointed out, however, that the comparison could be more easily utilized if it also highlighted divergences from the UN Model Regulations.

33. It was also noted that for European countries it would be useful as well to show divergences with countries linked by road transport to Europe, in particular in the context of Eurasian international land transport. It was emphasized in particular that where rail transport was concerned, there were still significant differences between RID and annex 2 of SMGS, which had still not been harmonized with the United Nations Model Regulations, including in the area of classification.

34. The representative of the United Kingdom requested that the Joint Meeting establish guiding principles for RID/ADR and ADN, just as the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts had done for the Model Regulations. That question remained unresolved.

VII. PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENTS TO RID/ADR/ADN (agenda item 6)

A. Pending issues

1. Outcome of the 44th session of the RID Committee of Experts
   (Zagreb, 19-23 November 2007)

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2008/5 (OTIF)

Informal document: INF.8 (OTIF)

35. The representative of the United Kingdom explained that he had withdrawn his document ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2008/9 on an amendment to 4.1.6.14, as the transitional provisions to accompany the proposed amendment required closer study.
36. The provisions in ADR about participants’ obligations to mark transport units for the transportation of dangerous goods carried in limited quantities could be aligned with RID, as the obligations might be the responsibility of the carrier or the consignor, depending on whether a vehicle or a container was involved.

37. With respect to the applicable provisions of RID or ADR in the case of dangerous goods packed in limited or excepted quantities, it seemed clear that, for example, the provisions of parts 2 and 3 were applicable, as Chapters 3.4 and 3.5 could not be applied until the dangerous goods had been assigned a UN number.

38. Any amendment to the current text would need to be the subject of a proposal.

B. New proposals

1. Dangerous goods packed in limited quantities

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2009/5 (FIATA)

39. The proposal to require consignors to inform carriers, in advance of carriage, of the total gross mass of dangerous goods packed in limited quantities submitted for carriage was adopted. The information need not be communicated in writing, as FIATA had requested, but it must be traceable (for example, faxes and emails would be acceptable) (see annex).

2. Used cells and batteries

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2009/7 (Sweden)

Informal document: INF.21 (EPBA, EBRA, RECHARGE)

40. The representative of Sweden temporarily withdrew her proposal, noting that the secretariat had submitted a document (ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2009/3) to the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods for its June 2009 session in order to avoid misunderstandings regarding interpretation of the scope of UN number 3028.

41. A member of the secretariat explained that UN number 3028 had been introduced for the transport of electric batteries containing potassium hydroxide solid, transported without electrolytes and activated before use by adding water. It was not intended to classify as dangerous goods the full line of commercially available cells listed in special provision 304.

42. Depending on the outcome of the discussion in the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts, the representative of Sweden would decide whether to keep her proposal on the agenda of the next session.

43. The representative of Belgium wondered whether batteries containing sodium (UN number 3292) should be explicitly excluded from the scope of special provision 636 (b), as special provision 598 did not apply to them.

44. Responding to a question raised by the representative of Portugal as to whether the carriage of used cells for domestic use was authorized in bulk, taking into consideration the possibility of
short circuits, the Chairman recalled that it was only the carriage of used cells for domestic use when mixed with used lithium cells that was not authorized; such carriage must meet the conditions of special provision 636 and packing instruction P903b. As explained by the secretariat, and unless the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts ruled otherwise in June, such used domestic-use cells were not themselves covered by the regulations.

3. Transport document for environmentally hazardous substances

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2009/14 (Sweden)

Informal documents: INF.20 (Sweden)
INF.24 (UIC)
INF.35 (Portugal)
INF.40 (Secretariat)

45. The representative of Sweden explained that it seemed necessary to indicate in the transport document when transported substances were environmentally hazardous so that carriers could fulfill their obligations with regard to vehicle markings. She pointed out that, for maritime carriage, the IMDG Code required the inscription “marine pollutant”.

46. With the exception of one delegation, the Joint Meeting accepted the principle of requiring an indication in the transport document. It would be necessary to specify the cases in which such an indication should be given, and interested delegations were requested to send their comments to the representative of Sweden so that she could prepare a suitable proposal for the next session.

47. As to the questions raised by the Government of Portugal in informal document INF.35, in particular relating to the possible establishment of a list of aquatic pollutants, it was pointed out that carriers were responsible for classifying dangerous goods on the basis of the corresponding criteria, which, as far as danger to the aquatic environment was concerned, appeared in ADR 2.2.9.1.10. With regard to the proposal to identify, in Table A of Chapter 3.2, substances of Classes 1 to 9 that met those criteria, in 2004 the secretariat had prepared a draft list (informal document INF.40) for the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods. However, the draft had not been endorsed by the Sub-Committee, which, unlike the International Maritime Organization and the Joint Meeting, did not consider it helpful to identify the danger to the aquatic environment posed by substances of classes 1 to 9 other than those assigned UN numbers 3077 or 3082.

VIII. REPORTS OF INFORMAL WORKING GROUPS (agenda item 7)

A. Report of the informal working group on the period of validity of type approvals and transitional measures for standards

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2009/3 (ECMA)

48. The Joint Meeting adopted the proposals of the informal working group except for the proposal in paragraph 17 of the report with a few minor amendments to 1.8.7.2.4 and 6.8.2.3.3 (see annex).
49. It was specified that manufacturers were usually responsible for requesting the renewal of type approvals, while certificate-issuing bodies were responsible for withdrawing them if a particular type approval was no longer in conformity with changing regulations. In the event of withdrawal or non-renewal, the provisions concerning utilization contained in the type approval remained valid for pressure receptacles, tanks, battery wagons/vehicles and MEGCs manufactured before the withdrawal or expiry of the type approval, provided that they could continue to be used. The review and assessment of a type approval for conformity with RID/ADR could be carried out by a body other than the one that had issued the original type approval certificate. If the body that had issued the original certificate was no longer accredited, its sphere of activity had been restricted or it had ceased to function, the competent authority must take the necessary measures to ensure that the documents for type approval were passed on to another body or were kept readily available.

50. The representative of Finland noted that the rules applicable to the validity of certificates might be applied to classes other than Class 2; for example, to the packagings and IBCs referred to in Chapters 6.1, 6.5 and 6.6. However, that would require more thorough study.

Informal document:   INF.45 (Belgium)

51. The representative of Belgium would prepare a new proposal aimed at explaining the transitional measures for equipment built before the expiration or withdrawal of a type approval.

B. Report of the informal working group on periodicity of testing of gas cylinders

Document:   ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2009/6 (Germany)

Informal document:   INF.33 (Germany)

52. The Joint Meeting took note of the progress made by the informal working group. It was noted that informal document INF.33 was only a draft, and that a final report, with the final proposals, would be submitted before the next session.

53. Note was taken of the fact that the working group had focused primarily on the possibility of extending the periodic testing interval from 10 to 15 years.

54. The representative of Sweden requested that the final report should specify which countries already applied the 15-year interval and should explain why they had extended the interval.

55. The Joint Meeting took note of the fact that EIGA also wished to examine the possibility of extending the interval to 15 years for other types of metal cylinders containing certain types of gas (for example, non-toxic and non-corrosive gases). Several delegations expressed reservations on that subject. The representative of EIGA said that it was too early to submit a proposal and that he needed to consult ECMA. He would wait to formulate a proposal at a later stage, when the time was right.
C. Report of the informal working group on telematics

Informal document: INF.4 (OTIF Secretariat)

56. The Joint Meeting took note of the interim report of the informal working group, which would meet again in Munich from 13 to 15 May 2009. The informal working group cooperated with the DATEX II project technical group, which defined the protocol for data transmission between traffic information and traffic management centres. The project covered multimodal transport, provided that some portion of the journey involved was by road.

57. The informal working group was also taking account of work on a draft directive of the European Parliament and of the Council of the European Union on the deployment of intelligent transport systems for road transport and interfaces with other modes of transport.

58. In May, the group expected to establish a matrix by which to identify any information that might be useful to the various participants in the transport chain, infrastructure managers and public authorities dealing with or responsible for inspection, emergency intervention or safety issues.

D. Report of the informal working group on the obligations of unloaders

Informal document: INF.22 (Spain)

59. The Joint Meeting generally favoured the texts proposed by the informal working group, and requested the secretariat to reproduce the proposed amendments in an official pre-session document for second reading at the next session.

60. The representative of IRU considered that the respective responsibilities and obligations of unloaders and carriers should be better defined. He was asked to prepare specific proposals for amendments if he considered that the texts drawn up by the working group were not satisfactory.

61. The representative of Spain drew attention to the points on which the working group considered that additional work would be useful:

   (a) Possible addition of a general note to Chapter 1.4, indicating that a given entity may in fact play the role, and have the obligations, of various participants;

   (b) The current texts on the loader and the filler were not sufficiently detailed;

   (c) The participants’ respective obligations were not clear in respect of the discharge of IBCs.

E. Report of the informal working group on the reduction of the risk of BLEVE

Informal document: INF.25 (Netherlands)

62. The Joint Meeting took note of the report of the working group. Another session would take place from 21 to 23 October 2009.
F. Report of the informal working group on the scope of RID/ADR/ADN

Informal document: INF.28 (France)

63. The Joint Meeting took note of the progress made by the group, which met twice, on 14 and 15 October 2008 in Paris and on 13 January 2009 in Bordeaux.

64. The Joint Meeting considered it worthwhile to continue work on the complex question of what could be covered by the regulations governing the transport of dangerous goods, even though that question was not particularly urgent. A new meeting should be held when appropriate. The Joint Meeting considered that the secretariats of ECE and OTIF and that of the European Commission should be present to explain the respective legal frameworks of ADR, RID, ADN and the European directives, as well as the background to the use of certain terms therein.

IX. FUTURE WORK (agenda item 8)

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2009/8 (European Commission)

Informal documents: INF.6 (Germany)
INF.30 (France)
INF.36 (Sweden)

65. The Joint Meeting accepted the proposal by the European Commission to set up an informal working group to consider provisions resulting from the revision of European directive 99/36/EC, known as TPED, so as to amend RID/ADR/ADN to include provisions relating to the retention of documents, additional inspection requirements and conformity assessment procedures for gas cartridges.

66. Some reservations were expressed about the proposal by Sweden to consider including in RID/ADR/ADN the requirements relating to “notified bodies” and “approved in-house bodies” in decision No. 768/2008/EC.

67. It was decided that, based on the proposals of the European Commission, the group’s terms of reference would be:

- To check which provisions should be included in RID/ADR/ADN
- To determine their proper placement (Chapters 1.8, 4.1, 6.2 or 6.8)
- To draft proposals for amendment to RID/ADR/ADN for possible entry into force on 1 January 2011
- To propose new provisions for the conformity assessment of gas cartridges
- To present the proposals at the September 2009 session of the Joint Meeting

68. The group would meet in Bonn from 3 to 5 June 2009, at the invitation of the Government of Germany.
X. ANY OTHER BUSINESS (agenda item 9)

A. Requests for consultative status

1. European Association of Dangerous Goods Safety Advisers (EASA)

Informal document: INF.7 (Secretariat)

69. The Joint Meeting was generally in favour of participation by a non-governmental organization representing safety advisers. It was, however, noted that the work of safety advisers consisted in improving the application of the RID/ADR/ADN requirements decided by regulators, and that they could not represent those who had to apply the regulations. It was thus necessary to define their scope of action.

70. Certain delegations also expressed some reservations. It was also noted that EASA had not provided the information normally required concerning its legal status and evidence of its representativeness at the European level. It was therefore requested to provide the information requested by the secretariat.

2. European Federation of Waste Management and Environmental Services (FEAD)

Informal documents: INF.18 and Add.1 (Secretariat)

71. The Joint Meeting welcomed the provision of information by FEAD and confirmed the consultative status that it had previously granted to it (TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/98, para. 69).

B. Tributes

72. The Joint Meeting was informed that Mr. G. Perez Perez-Herrero (Spain) would no longer take part in its work. It thanked him warmly for his active contribution and wished him a long and happy retirement.

73. The Joint Meeting was saddened to learn that for health reasons, Mr. Jean-Daniel Denervaud (OTIF) could not take part in the session, which was supposed to be the last one of his 37-year career in the OTIF secretariat. While paying tribute to his dedication and the quality of his work during a career dedicated to serving the RID Committee of Experts and the Joint Meeting, it wished him a quick recovery and a long and happy retirement.

XI. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT (agenda item 10)

74. The Joint Meeting adopted the report on its spring 2009 session and its annex on the basis of a draft prepared by the secretariats.
Annex

TEXTS ADOPTED BY THE JOINT MEETING

(Draft amendments to RID, ADR and ADN for entry into force on 1 January 2011)

(see ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/114/Add.1)