Introduction

1. Paragraph 6 of the Annex to informal document INF.18 says that "to facilitate Euro-Asian transport, harmonization of the Agreement on International Goods Transport by Rail (SMGS), annex 2 (applicable in Central and Eastern Europe and Asia) with RID (applicable in Western and Central Europe, the Middle East and North Africa) would be highly desirable. WP.15, OTIF and OSJD may wish to consider joint procedures or activities, or to strengthen existing mechanisms to accelerate the updating of annex II of SMGS and resolve remaining differences between RID and SMGS, annex II as deemed appropriate".

2. As already noted by the OTIF representative at the meeting of the Inland Transport Committee, annex 2 to SMGS has already been well harmonised since RID was restructured. The structure of annex 2 to SMGS is now fully aligned with RID and the vast majority of the provisions are identical in the two sets of regulations. In addition, amendments to annex 2 to SMGS now enter into force at almost the same time as amendments to RID. Whilst previously, at least four years had to be reckoned for the process of alignment, each of the corresponding editions of annex 2 to SMGS is now applicable six months after the RID amendments have entered into force.
3. In the period between 22 and 26 August 2011, an ad hoc OSJD working group met to deal with the differences that exist between RID and annex 2 to SMGS. The working group went through a table prepared by the representatives of Latvia and Poland in which these differences were set out individually.

4. At the first meeting of the working group, it was first necessary to establish which differences are justified and which differences could perhaps be eliminated on the basis of specific proposals.

Main differences

5. Differences are primarily to be found in Chapters 4.3 and 6.8, which are certainly justifiable for broad gauge tank-wagons. References to EN standards in Chapter 6.8 are also obstacles for various non-European States.

6. However, it was also established that there are differences in the provisions concerning the construction of tank-containers according to RID/ADR on the one hand, and tank-containers according to annex 2 to SMGS on the other, which, if possible, should be eliminated owing to the multimodal nature of means of transport such as these. Among other things, it became clear that the provisions for RID/ADR tank-containers, which were originally developed for Western and Central Europe, are not completely suitable owing to the minimum temperatures that are possible in the geographical area covered by SMGS. For example, while RID/ADR assume a reference temperature range of -20°C to +50°C, annex 2 to SMGS assumes a temperature range of -40°C to +50°C.

7. In this context, the representative of OTIF pointed out that as a result of these differing construction provisions for tank-containers, multimodality in the legal area of SMGS was jeopardised, because in some SMGS Member States which are also Contracting Parties to ADR, the tank-container provisions of ADR are applied without modification.

8. Provisions in annex 2 to SMGS which only concern certain SMGS Member States may also be a further obstacle to traffic between Europe and Asia. In most cases, these derogations concern Kazakhstan, Russia, the Ukraine and Belarus.

9. According to RID 5.2.2.2.1.5, danger labels (and placards) may only contain other text indicating the nature of the risk and precautions to be taken in handling. But the information prescribed in annex 2 to SMGS concerning the emergency card to be used (three-figure number) may also, as an alternative, be indicated on the placards. This regularly causes problems in transport operations from the SMGS area into the RID area, because these numbers may not be indicated according to RID, and they can also be confused with the hazard identification number.

Future work

10. The Joint Meeting should encourage the OSJD ad hoc working group to continue on the path to achieve the widest possible harmonisation. Thanks are particularly due to the representatives of Latvia and Poland for their preparatory work and firm commitment to harmonising both sets of regulations.