

**Economic and Social Council**

Distr.: General  
9 May 2023  
English  
Original: French

---

**Economic Commission for Europe****Inland Transport Committee****Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods**

**Joint Meeting of Experts on the Regulations annexed to the European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Inland Waterways (ADN) (ADN Safety Committee)**

**Forty-second session**

Geneva, 21–25 August 2023

Item 3 (d) of the provisional agenda

**Implementation of the European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Inland Waterways (ADN):  
Training of experts**

**Report of the 23rd meeting of the informal working group on the training of experts****Transmitted by the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine (CCNR)\* \*\***

1. The informal working group on the training of experts held its 23rd meeting, chaired by Mr. Bölker (Germany), as a hybrid session, in Strasbourg from 28 to 30 March 2023. Representatives of the following States took part in the meeting: Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands and Switzerland. The following non-governmental associations and training bodies were represented: the European Barge Union (EBU); the European Skippers Organisation (ESO); the International Committee for the Prevention of Work Accidents in Inland Navigation (CIPA); GUSPAF GmbH; and HGK Ship Management (training body).

**I. Adoption of the agenda**

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2023/2 a (Agenda)

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2022/22 (Report of the 24th meeting)

Informal document INF.8 of the forty-first session (Report of the 24th meeting)

2. The report of the 24th meeting was adopted without amendment.

---

\* Distributed in German by the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine under the symbol CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WP.15/AC.2/2023/20.

\*\* A/77/6 (Sect. 20), table 20.6.



## II. Work schedule

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2022/2022/6 rev.3 (Work schedule)

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/2023/2

Informal document INF.8 of the forty-first session, para. 16

3. The Chair noted that the work schedule had been approved by the ADN Safety Committee at its last meeting, and had not given rise to any other communication.

## III. Continuous updating of the ADN catalogue of questions 2023

### (Item 1 of the work schedule)

ADN catalogue of questions 2023 General

([https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2023-02/ADN\\_catalogue\\_of\\_questions\\_2023\\_General\\_en.pdf](https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2023-02/ADN_catalogue_of_questions_2023_General_en.pdf))

ADN catalogue of questions 2023 Chemicals

([https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2023-02/ADN\\_catalogue\\_of\\_questions\\_2023\\_Chemicals\\_en.pdf](https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2023-02/ADN_catalogue_of_questions_2023_Chemicals_en.pdf))

ADN catalogue of questions 2023 Gas

([https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2023-02/ADN\\_catalogue\\_of\\_questions\\_2023\\_Gas\\_en.pdf](https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2023-02/ADN_catalogue_of_questions_2023_Gas_en.pdf))

Informal document INF.2 of the forty-first session – ADN catalogue of questions 2023 General – Summary

Informal document INF.3 of the forty-first session – ADN catalogue of questions 2023 Chemicals – Summary

Informal document INF.4 of the forty-first session – ADN catalogue of questions 2023 Chemicals – Summary

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/2011/4 – 17 – CCNR (Confidential documents, ADN 2011, substantive questions)

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2023/3

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2023/4

4. The working group addressed the questions mentioned in document CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2023/4.

5. The Chair noted in respect of question **331 04.0–02** that answers A and D could also be correct for certain temperature ranges, but that that restricted the question excessively. The question could be amended as follows: “Which of the following is always true ...”. The question was therefore temporarily **put on hold**, and would be updated as part of the continuous updating of the catalogue of questions for 2025.

6. The Chair noted that the wording of question 332 03.0–22 was also too restrictive in view of answers A and D. The only correct answer was C. There was no need to suspend the use of the question, but it should be revised for 2025.

7. The Chair noted that the question mentioned in document CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2023/3 had been withdrawn.

8. A representative of EBU/ESO presented a list of additional comments on the catalogue of questions.

9. The Chair noted that, with regard to question 110 08.0–47, answer C should be amended, replacing “foam” by “powder”. The question should therefore be **put on hold** and the amendment could be reflected in the 2025 catalogue of questions.

10. The Chair noted that, in the correct answers to questions **110 08.0–59** and **110 08.0–61**, the word “cold” should be deleted before “water”. That change would be reflected in the 2025 catalogue of questions. However, there was no need to suspend the questions, which could still be used.

11. The Chair noted that, in question **120 03.0–05**, that the words “Hold 2 and” were deleted at the beginning of answer A, since hold 2 only needed to be ventilated after unloading. That question should therefore be **put on hold** with a view to it being updated as part of the continuous updating of the catalogue of questions for 2025.

12. The Chair noted, in respect of question **130 06.0–04**, that the wording of the correct answer, D, was wrong and should be replaced by “At least once a week”. That question should therefore be **put on hold** with a view to it being updated as part of the continuous updating of the catalogue of questions for 2025.

13. The Chair noted, with regard to question **130 08.0–12**, that the substances had been added deliberately, to bring the wording more into line with practice. To improve intelligibility, the question could be updated as part of the continuous updating of the catalogue of questions for 2025, by deleting “and during gas-freeing of tank vessels”. There was no need to suspend the use of the question.

14. The Chair noted that the wording of question **130 08.0–23** was not sufficiently precise and that the question should therefore be **put on hold**. The scenario for the question could be reviewed at the next meeting and, if possible, the question could be worded without using the negative.

15. The Chair noted that, in question **130 08.0–29**, UN No. 1202 should be replaced by UN No. 1231. That question should therefore be **put on hold** with a view to it being updated as part of the continuous updating of the catalogue of questions for 2025.

16. The working group reviewed the substantive questions on gas. It was noted that, in general, there were not many changes to the questions. The current questions could therefore still be used without any significant effect on quality. However, some more substantial amendments were needed to the proposed answers, which were scheduled for review at a separate meeting on 6 and 7 October, possibly in the form of a video conference.

17. The Chair concluded by noting that the work would continue at the next meeting, in March 2024. The substantive questions on chemicals should be reviewed after that. It was agreed that additional documents would be accepted during the consideration. He invited the CCNR secretariat to submit a proposal for the presentation of the work to the ADN Safety Committee with a view to its adoption, ensuring that the documents remained confidential. A representative of the industry expressed willingness to review annex I of the Administrative Committee’s guidelines on the use of the catalogue of questions for the ADN expert examination in respect of substance properties.

## **A. ADN 2023**

### **(Item 1.3 of the work schedule)**

18. A representative of the industry suggested that, in view of technical developments, some new questions should be added to the catalogue of questions to better reflect the real situation on board vessels.

19. The Chair welcomed the initiative by the industry and invited all participants to submit new questions for the next meeting.

## **B. Updating of the directive on the use of the catalogue of questions for the ADN expert examination**

### **(Item 2.1 of the work schedule)**

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/2023/4

Informal document INF.8 of the 41st session, para. 17

20. The Chair concluded by noting that the informal working group did not consider it necessary to regulate possible interruptions to training courses in ADN. Interpretation of ADN already allowed for interruptions, as they were not forbidden.

21. The Chair also noted that the guidelines on the use of the catalogue of questions for the ADN expert examination should also be updated during the updating of the substantive questions.

## **IV. ADN expert training and examination**

**(Item 2.1 of the work schedule)**

### **A. Research report on the administration of ADN examinations**

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2019/6 (Research report on the administration of ADN examinations – the Netherlands)

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/68, para. 24

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/70, para. 27

22. The representative of the Netherlands recalled the conclusions mentioned in communication CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2019/6. He also recalled the work of the informal working group aimed at simplifying the wording in the catalogue of questions, as well as the discussion on extending the duration of the examinations. He recalled the decision of the ADN Safety Committee to wait and see what effect that would have on examination results. He concluded that there was no need to take action for the time being, and suggested that the topic be placed on the agenda for 2025.

23. The Chair concluded by noting that all the participants agreed with the conclusions drawn by the representative of the Netherlands. However, document CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2019/6 would continue to serve as the basis for further work in 2025.

### **B. Recognition of training courses in accordance with 8.2**

Informal document INF.8 of the 41st session, para. 16

24. A representative of the training organizations explained that the increase in the number of hours per day or of days in the duration of training courses particularly concerned specific courses on gas and chemicals, as participants often did not have sufficient mathematical knowledge in those fields. Consequently, the durations set out in ADN were considered as minimum durations.

25. The Chair concluded the discussion on that point by noting that the informal working group considered it essential that the minimum number of hours per course for face-to-face training be respected, but that it was possible to extend that number of hours if necessary.

### **C. Training of instructors, deliberation on the need for recommendations on minimum requirements and standards for the certification of instructors**

**(Item 3 (previously item 2.4.3) of the work schedule)**

26. The Chair asked how instructor qualifications could be verified for online training courses.

27. A representative of the training bodies pointed out, using a recent example involving an online training course, that training programmes and instructor requirements were submitted to the competent authority for approval. The training body was responsible for the

organization and the quality of the training course. Instructors involved in the asynchronous e-learning approach were not identified to the authorities.

## **D. Harmonization of 8.2, Requirements concerning training, with 8.2 of ADR**

### **(Item 2.3 of the work schedule)**

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2019/5 – Online refresher training for drivers

OTIF/RID/RC/2018/10 (identical to ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2018/10)

Informal document: INF.4 of the autumn 2020 session of the ADR/RID/ADN Joint Meeting

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/166 (Report of the autumn 2022 session of the ADR/RID/ADN Joint Meeting)

Informal document INF.8 of the 41st session, paras. 18–20

28. The representative of Germany recalled a discussion at the ADR/RID/ADN Joint Meeting during which it was mentioned that e-learning should in principle be permitted. He noted that the introduction of e-learning might necessitate a different training structure, depending on the format, and that the rules governing the structure of those formats might need to be included in ADN. He suggested that the persons concerned should also be consulted as to their needs and any proposals they might like to make.

29. The representative of the Netherlands agreed with the representative of Germany. He wondered whether an upper limit of eight lessons a day should be maintained. He considered that the requirements for e-learning offerings should not be given in too much detail in ADN; instead, it should mention the functional requirements, i.e. what training to provide, when it should be learned and where it should be learned. He drew attention to disparities between the language versions of ADN in respect of distance learning in 8.2.2.4 of ADN, and invited the secretariat to make the relevant corrections.

30. The Chair was of the view that, if rules on the scope and structure of training were necessary, they should be incorporated into ADN and not be subject to interpretation.

31. A representative of the training bodies considered that the current provisions were sufficient and there was no need to amend ADN. As it was comparable to distance learning, which was already permitted, e-learning was also already permitted. Face-to-face video training using electronic means could be envisaged, but the mere fact of videos being made available was not relevant.

32. The representative of the CCNR secretariat asked whether the concept of e-learning had already been defined in the context of the Joint Meeting. He suggested compiling an overview of formats and modules.

33. The representative of Germany considered that the demands of e-learning were not the same as those of distance learning. The rest periods prescribed by the regulations should not be used to learn prescribed content. That must be taken into account when permitting e-learning. He recalled communication CCNR-CNR/ADN/WG/CQ/2023/5, in which a request had been made for a date for a meeting of the Joint Meeting's informal working group to draw up an inventory of possible formats for e-learning. He invited those present to attend the meeting, during which a definition and possible formats and modules would also be discussed.

34. A representative of the training bodies confirmed the German representative's statement concerning rest periods, but also pointed out that, given the absence of uniform recording of working time at the European level, there were limited possibilities for monitoring. It was also important to ensure that it was the registered course participant who was taking part in the e-learning, and not a third party in his or her place. It was important not to lose sight of the purpose of the ADN expert training. The high quality of the training provided must continue to be guaranteed, in whatever format it was offered. He suggested that e-learning and distance learning could also be offered for refresher courses in the future.

35. A representative of the training bodies presented an asynchronous e-learning system as a complex management system.
36. The representative of Germany recalled the need for data protection and asked how it could be guaranteed that no third party used the system in place of the participant.
37. The representative of the training bodies replied that authentication ensured that only the participant could take part in the training course. A special interface was used to track individual learning, but not individual activities.
38. A representative of the industry was of the view that e-learning was a very useful addition to the system and reported that the trials conducted had produced positive results. However, e-learning could not replace face-to-face courses. He believed that it would be very difficult to agree on a common e-learning standard for all the contracting parties to ADN. He warmly welcomed the fact that a discussion was taking place on the subject within the informal working group. He thought that the results obtained were very positive. The aim should be to establish a regulatory framework conducive to innovation.
39. The representative of CIPA was of the same view. E-learning could be useful as a complement to the system.
40. The Chair concluded by noting that a distinction needed to be made between e-learning and distance learning courses. In the future, ADN expert training could include synchronous training methods (face-to-face training, face-to-face training in hybrid form and face-to-face training in purely electronic form (videoconferencing)) and asynchronous training methods (learning activities, discussions and task completion where participants learn at their own pace and at times of their choosing). In that context, the requirements for training bodies, venues and events were different. There was as yet no universal definition of the concept of e-learning, but one should be created for the ADN training. Onboard training should take place during working hours, not during free time or rest periods. In addition, a distinction must be made between compulsory learning regulated by ADN and optional supplementary learning or exam preparation for the examination. There was consensus that practical work should continue to take place in a face-to-face setting. He invited the participants to actively follow the work of the Joint Meeting and, where appropriate, to take part in it.
41. The Chair added that basic training courses could already be delivered in a live online format. In that case, instructors and students had to always be present. However, in the context of a complex management system, other formats might be permitted. But that would entail major constraints for the authorities when approving training courses. Nevertheless, requirements should not be set out in detail in ADN; the focus should rather be on the training and examination objectives to be achieved. The aim was to open up the possibility of permitting the use of new means and methods of learning, in both synchronous formats (e.g. live online) and asynchronous formats (e.g. within the framework of a timetable set by the persons concerned). The ADN Safety Committee was invited to set guidelines for further work on learning methods.
42. The Chair went on to note that face-to-face training should be maintained under the current provisions of ADN.
43. The representative of Germany entered a reservation for verification.

## **E. Content of training as per 8.2.2.3.1 of ADN**

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/ 2019/13 (content of training courses – EBU)

44. The informal working group examined industry communication CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2019/13.
45. A representative of the training bodies believed that the points raised had already been taken into account in the training.
46. The Chair noted that there was no immediate need to deal with the issue.

## **F. Analysis of examination statistics**

### **(Item 2.2.1 of the work schedule)**

47. A representative of the industry pointed out that, in the Netherlands, all results were forwarded by the training bodies to the competent authority and that the examination results were evaluated. Test results should also be recorded. He also suggested checking to what extent it was possible to interpret the data properly. He further suggested investigating why examination pass rates varied from one contracting party to another; that could also be done in the context of the planned revision of the duration of the examinations from 2025. He proposed that countries that did not organize examinations should indicate that with a line in the table.

48. The representative of the Netherlands confirmed that exhaustive statistical evaluations had been conducted of the examinations, including for refresher courses, and that the results could be provided. He agreed with the industry representative that the examination statistics must be interpreted with great caution in respect of the quality of the training.

49. A representative of the training bodies suggested checking whether the examination requirements were still sufficient or, conversely, whether they were all still necessary. An expert working on a container ship would apply fewer provisions of ADN than an expert working on a vessel carrying dangerous goods in bulk. As a result, examination requirements could be adapted or reduced for experts working on board container ships.

50. A representative of the training bodies also pointed out that there might be gaps in the languages in which examinations were offered, and that they should be taken into account when analysing examination statistics. He also proposed that guidance should be given on how to provide and calculate statistics, to ensure uniformity of calculation and evaluation.

51. The representative of CIPA suggested that the course format (synchronous or asynchronous) should also be taken into account in the evaluation, in view of the discussions taking place on e-learning.

52. The Chair noted that the table for evaluating examination statistics did not currently need to be reviewed, but that some indication would be useful to ensure uniform data collection. The Contracting Parties were again reminded to submit their examination and test results, with the teaching format. To that end, the informal working group would submit to the ADN Safety Committee a document containing proposals describing the issue and possible options for improving the statistical basis.

## **V. Clarification of general issues related to the catalogue of questions**

### **(Item 3 of the work schedule)**

53. A representative of the industry said that he would forward to the representative of the Netherlands a document containing proposals for improving the Dutch translation.

54. The Chair noted that the English version of the catalogue of questions contained an error in question **110 08.0–74**. He invited the CCNR secretariat, in cooperation with the ECE secretariat, to correct the error.

## **VI. Other proposals for amendments to the Regulations annexed to ADN**

### **A. Number of appropriate self-contained breathing apparatuses**

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/2023/3, para. 14

55. The representative of the Netherlands recalled the discussion on self-contained breathing apparatuses. A discussion in the Netherlands had highlighted that a provision

needed to be added to ADN to ensure that one self-contained breathing apparatus per crew member was available on board.

56. A representative of the training bodies recalled that self-contained breathing apparatuses were only required for carrying out work. There was also a provision in ADN that escape devices must be available on board. In principle, those could also be used as respiratory protective devices. As a result, it was not necessary to amend ADN.

57. A representative of the industry confirmed that statement and agreed that there was no need to amend ADN.

58. The Chair concluded by noting that the outcome of the discussion was that the informal working group considered that there was no need to amend ADN.

## **VII. Calendar**

59. The next meeting of the informal working group was scheduled for 19 to 21 March 2024 in Strasbourg.

60. The Chair thanked the participants for their valuable and constructive contributions to the discussions; he also thanked the CCNR secretariat for organizing the meeting of the informal working group on the training of experts and for its active contribution to the smooth running of the meeting.

---