



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
4 January 2012

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, 19–23 March 2012

Item 5 (a) of the provisional agenda

Proposals for amendments to RID/ADR/ADN: pending issues

Questions pending from the fiftieth session of the RID Committee of Experts (Malmö, 21–25 November 2011)

Transmitted by the Secretariat of OTIF^{1,2}

1. At the fiftieth session of the RID Committee of Experts (Malmö, 21 – 25 November 2011) various minor questions concerning the 2013 amendments to RID were unresolved. The RID Committee of Experts asked that these be brought to the attention of the Joint Meeting.

2. The extracts from the report of the fiftieth session of the RID Committee of Experts (document OTIF/RID/CE/2011-A) referring to these unresolved matters are reproduced below.

“Special provision 636 (b)

13. The representative of Switzerland pointed out that in previous editions of RID, special provision 636 had stipulated that used lithium cells and batteries could only be carried to intermediate processing facilities under simplified conditions if they were carried together with other batteries not containing any lithium. But a proposal from Switzerland to maintain this condition in the revised special provision had been rejected at the last session of WP.15. The representative of Sweden announced a proposal for the Joint Meeting.

Informal documents: INF.2 and INF.4 (CEN)

¹ In accordance with the programme of work of the Inland Transport Committee for 2010–2014 (ECE/TRANS/208, para. 106, ECE/TRANS/2010/8, programme activity 02.7 (c)).

² Circulated by the Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail (OTIF) under the symbol OTIF/RID/RC/2012/18.

Packing instruction P 200

14. The RID Committee of Experts adopted the amended reference to the standard in paragraph (7) (b) of packing instruction P 200 proposed by CEN in informal document INF.2 (see Annex I). As references to standards were usually followed by the year, the secretariat was asked to contact the CEN consultant on this question. It was also unclear why the English text adopted by WP.15 was different from the original text provided by the CEN consultant. The secretariat was instructed to agree a uniform text with the UNECE secretariat, including the French version.

15. The amendment proposed by CEN in informal document INF.4 was also adopted, although standards EN 1801:1998 and EN 12754:2001 can only be deleted if standard EN ISO 11372:2011 is published in time before the 51st session of the RID Committee of Experts (see Annex I).

6.2.4.1

17. The representative of the United Kingdom pointed out that in the various amendments to column (4) of 6.2.4.1, sometimes the deadline was "until 31 December 2014" and sometimes it was "before 1 January 2015". The Joint Meeting's working group on standards was asked to standardise these deadlines.

18. The representative of Switzerland pointed out that the amendment to the column heading in the table in 6.2.4.2 adopted by WP.15 should also be made to 6.8.2.6.2. However, as this was not yet a problem, because no standards were included which had to be applied from a certain date, this decision was also referred to the Joint Meeting's working group on standards.

7.3.2.4

19. In connection with not including flexible bulk containers, the RID Committee of Experts agreed not to delete completely the amendment concerning 7.3.2.4, but to maintain the addition of code "BK2" and the second amendment, which only applied to the English version (see Annex I). The secretariat was asked to inform the UNECE secretariat of this differing amendment.

Incident report and discussion on the question of notifying occurrences involving dangerous goods in accordance with 1.8.5

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/2011/5 (Switzerland)

49. In his document OTIF/RID/CE/2011/5, the representative of Switzerland pointed out that at present, 1.8.5.2 did not contain any criteria on when the RID Contracting States had to send the secretariat an accident report. Up to now, very few States had transmitted their accident reports to the secretariat.

50. The Chairman recalled that the original intention had been only to notify those accidents which, in the opinion of the notifying State, might have repercussions in terms of developing the regulations. However, in the meantime the Joint Meeting's "BLEVE" working group had said it wished to set up a database to enable statistical analysis to be carried out (see report ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/124 (OTIF/RID/RC/2011-B) paragraph 109).

51. The RID Committee of Experts considered it necessary to provide clarification concerning the application of 1.8.5.2. It should also be checked whether the accident report form should be adapted to make statistical analysis possible, and whether the secretariat should also be sent the results of the accident investigation as well as the form itself, as it was only such results that would make it possible to develop the

regulations. However, owing to the consequences for ADR, these questions should be dealt with at the Joint Meeting.

52. Following the discussion at the Joint Meeting, the RID Committee of Experts could then look at the question of whether it would be necessary to align with Directive 2004/49/EC with regard to the safety indicators.”.
