



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1999/6
2 March 1999

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on the Transport
of Dangerous Goods

Joint Meeting of the RID Safety Committee
and the Working Party on the Transport of
Dangerous Goods

(Bern, 25-28 May 1999)

RESTRUCTURING OF RID AND ADR

Report of the thirteenth session of the RID Committee of Experts

Working Group on the Restructuring of RID

(Krakow, 25-29 January 1999)

Transmitted by the Central Office for International
Carriage by Rail (OCTI)*

The secretariat has received from the Central Office for International Carriage by Rail (OCTI) the report reproduced below.

* Distributed by the Central Office for International Carriage by Rail (OCTI) under the symbol OCTI/RID/GT-III/1999/6.

ATTENDANCE

1. At the invitation of the Polish Railways (PKP), the RID Committee of Experts Working Group on the Restructuring of RID held its thirteenth session in Krakow from 25 to 29 January 1999. Representatives of the following countries took part in its work: Austria; Belgium; Czech Republic; France; Germany; Hungary; Italy; Netherlands; Poland; United Kingdom. The following were also represented: International Union of Railways (UIC); International Union of Private Railway Wagon Owners' Associations (UIP); European Industrial Gases Association (EIGA). Mr. W. Visser (NS, Netherlands) acted as Chairman.

Agenda item 1: Tanks

2. In the context of this agenda item the Chairman referred to paragraphs 62 to 93 of the report of the September 1998 Joint Meeting (see document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/74-OCTI/RID/GT-III/1998-B).

3. The representative of Germany, referring to paragraph 70 of this report, suggested that for the purposes of harmonization, it could be recommended to WP.15 that tank codes should also be placed on tank vehicles, even if it seemed unnecessary in view of the fact that the certificate of approval must always be on board the vehicle.

Document -/1998/1, annex 1

4. The Working Group went on to consider questions specific to tanks pending following the meeting of the small working group on Part 1.

Structural equipment (paragraph 19, No. 8)

5. The Central Office drew attention in document L7 to the fact that in the present RID/ADR the stabilization elements were an integral part of the structural equipment of tank-containers but not of tank-wagons/tank-vehicles.

6. The Chairman pointed out that the stabilization elements of a tank-container were appliances external to the shells which prevented any change in the attitude (e.g. overturning, rolling) of the shell. This did not concern devices inside shells, such as surge-plates, for example, and the structural equipment of tank-containers and tank-wagons/tank-vehicles was thus actually different.

7. The Working Group decided to subdivide the definition of structural equipment into (a) for tank-containers, (b) for tank-wagons/tank-vehicles and (c) for IBCs, while maintaining present differences and only including elements "external" to shells, as the United Nations Recommendations did.

1.6 Transitional measures (paragraph 24)

8. In its document L7 the Central Office noted that the majority of transitional measures referred to tank-containers and tank-wagons/tank-vehicles and that it could be envisaged transferring these transitional measures to Chapter 4.2 (utilization).

9. The Working Group decided to keep all transitional measures in Part 1 and to include a reference to the transitional measures of Part 1 in 4.2.1.7.

Mild steel, reference steel (paragraph 30, No. 3 (b))

10. In document L13, the Central Office wondered whether there was a need to include a definition for reference steel, as in the United Nations Recommendations (Part 6). The term "reference steel" was only currently used in RID/ADR in conjunction with IBCs, since the Appendices on tanks referred only to "mild steel" and "mild reference steel".

11. The representative of Germany considered that the definition of reference steel in the United Nations Recommendations ("steel with a tensile strength of 370 N/mm² and an elongation at fracture of 27%") should be included in RID/ADR, since this was an artificial steel the values of which were used as conversion values to calculate the wall-thickness for other metals.

12. The definition of "mild steel" should be kept, however, since the wall-thickness of the steels falling within this definition required no conversion. In this context, it might be wondered whether paragraph 6.6.2.4.9 of the United Nations Recommendations should not be included ("When mild steel is used, calculation using the formula in 6.6.2.4.6 is not required") in Chapter 6.7 to clarify the situation.

13. The Working Group supported this opinion and made the following additional amendments to Chapter 6.7 (document -/AC.1/1998/39):

- footnote 2/ to 6.7.1.1.24, read:

"For the definitions of 'mild steel' and 'reference steel' see under 1.2.1".

- in footnote 3/ to 6.7.1.1.24 amend the key to R_{m0} and A_0 to read:

" R_{m0} = 370 (minimum limit of tensile strength for reference steel, see definition under 1.2.1)"

" A_0 = 27 (minimum elongation at fracture)."

Portable tanks (paragraph 30 (c))

14. In its document L13, the Central Office wondered whether the definition of "portable tank" of the United Nations Recommendations should not be included in RID/ADR. The London small working group was of the opinion that this very broad definition resembled the definition of "tank-container" and should therefore not be included.

15. The Working Group considered that a definition was necessary, since in a specific column of table A in Chapter 3.2 there was a reference to types of these new portable tanks and because a tank-container within the meaning of the United Nations Recommendations must comply with the provisions of the CSC. This was the reason for including in square brackets a brief definition

referring back to the United Nations Recommendations. In addition, a reference had been included to the new edition of the IMDG Code so as to avoid confusion with the old portable tanks according to the IMDG Code which were not in conformity with the United Nations Recommendations: "[a multimodal tank of a capacity greater than 450 l in accordance with the definition of the United Nations Recommendations or the IMDG Code, xxxx edition, indicated by a tank code (T-code) in column [] of table H of Chapter 32]"

1.1.4.3 Use of approved tank-containers for maritime transport

16. In this context the Working Group discussed the problems of the use in carriage by land of tank-containers approved for maritime transport (present marginal 1.9/212 190 of Appendix X/B.1b). Since on the one hand the requirements of the United Nations Recommendations concerning multimodal tanks must be incorporated into the new IMDG Code while on the other hand the construction of IMO tank-containers according to the requirements of the present IMDG Code during a transitional period up to 2003 and their use until the end of their lifespan must be authorized, the need arose for RID/ADR to regulate the use of these two types of tank-containers/portable tanks in carriage by land.

17. The Working Group proposed that the use of former IMO tank-containers should be regulated as follows in paragraph 1.1.4.3.1:

"Tank-containers which do not fully meet the requirements of Chapter 6.8, but which have been approved in accordance [with the transitional provisions of amendment 30/2001] of the IMDG Code for maritime transport as portable tanks, may be used subject to the following conditions: [only substances accepted for carriage in RID/ADR tank-containers in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 3.2, table A, column [] may be carried.]

Note: For the indication in the consignment note/transport document, see [5.4.2]."

18. Use of the new portable tanks should be regulated as follows in paragraph 1.1.4.3.2:

"Tank-containers which do not fully meet the requirements of Chapter 6.8, but which have been approved in accordance with the United Nations Recommendations or the IMDG Code as portable tanks, may be used subject to the following condition: [only substances accepted for carriage in RID/ADR tank-containers in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 3.2, table A, column [], may be carried.]

Note: For the indication in the consignment note/transport document, see [5.4.2]."

Document C2 (EIGA)

19. In this document the representative of EIGA proposed that the provisions for battery-wagons/battery-vehicles and multiple-element tank-containers should be taken out of Chapter 6.7 and put into a special Chapter 6.8. He justified this procedure by the fact that, although, in accordance with the

present requirements of RID/ADR, tanks were indeed also permitted as elements of a battery-wagon/battery-vehicle or of a multiple-element tank-container, in practice only cylinders, tubes and bundles of cylinders (frames) were used and their manufacture and testing were covered by the present Class 2 and not by Appendices X and XI/B.1b and B.1a. Current practice had shown that on the one hand the shipper wondered which requirements of the tank appendices were to be applied to battery-wagons/battery-vehicles and multiple-element tank-containers, while on the other hand different interpretations resulted in different States.

20. Since many provisions in the proposed Chapter 6.8 were identical to those of Chapter 6.7 and since EIGA had not felt that it was necessary to dissociate Chapter 4.2 on the use of tanks, some delegations considered that the requirements for battery-wagons/battery-vehicles and multiple-element tank-containers should rather have a special section (6.7.2) in Chapter 6.7 itself.

21. The representative of Belgium pointed out that the requirements for tank-wagons/tank-vehicles and tank-containers had been grouped in the context of the restructuring in order to avoid duplication in the regulations. This principle should not be violated by dissociating the requirements for battery-wagons/battery-vehicles and multiple-element tank-containers.

22. The representative of the United Kingdom, however, was of the opinion that the aim of avoiding duplication in the regulations should come second to that of enhancing user-friendliness.

23. The Chairman asked the representative of EIGA to prepare an analysis for the next meeting of the Working Group which would show which provisions of Chapters 6.7 and 6.8 applied to battery-wagons/battery-vehicles and multiple-element tank-containers. On the basis of this analysis it would be easier to decide whether the requirements should appear in their own chapter or only in a section of Chapter 6.7.

24. A provisional vote gave the result of five delegations in favour of a Chapter 6.8, four in favour of a section 6.7.2 and two delegations abstaining.

25. The representative of EIGA finally pointed out that in his document C2 he had also proposed that the provisions for the filling of tanks for gases of Class 2 and for periodic tests should be included in Chapter 4.2 and not in Chapter 6.7 as UIC had proposed, since these requirements were directed at users. As proposed in a document transmitted to the United Nations Committee of Experts, the term "multiple-element gas container" (MEGC) had been used instead of "multiple-element tank-container".

Document C5 (UIP)

26. UIP, BAM and UIC had received a mandate from the London working group at its last session to consider the document with a view to ascertaining to what extent the divergent provisions for tank-wagons/tank-vehicles and tank-containers were still necessary or could be eliminated (see the report TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1999/1, para. 26).

6.7

27. The presentation of the general provisions for application under 6.7 would be brought into line with that of section 4.2.1 of document -/1998/26/Rev.1; subsection 4.2.1.2 would become unnecessary and in subsections 4.2.1.1 and 4.2.1.3 the references to "tank-wagons/tank-vehicles" and "tank-containers" respectively would be replaced three times by "tank-wagons, [battery-wagons] and wagons with movable tanks/tank-vehicles (fixed tanks), [battery-vehicles], and vehicles with demountable tanks", and "tank-containers and swap body tanks" respectively.

28. The text of 4.2.1.4 (second-last subparagraph of 6.7) should read:

"These requirements shall apply to tank-wagons, [battery-wagons] and wagons with movable tanks/tank-vehicles (fixed tanks), [battery-vehicles] and vehicles with demountable tanks	to tank-containers and swap body tanks
--	--

used for the carriage of liquid, gaseous, powdery or granular substances, and to their accessories."

The limit value of 0.45 m³ for tank-containers was deleted since it was already to be found in the definition of tank-containers in 1.2.1.

6.7.1.1.6

29. This paragraph was adapted, as UIP had proposed, by replacing the terms "tank-wagons/tank-vehicles" and "tank-containers" by "tanks/shells". This meant that the present requirements for tank-wagons would be expanded, without adverse effects, however, since the possibilities of achieving the objective pursued were indicated.

30. With regard to the use of the term "citerne" ("tank"/"Tank"), it was noted that there was no current definition in RID, unlike ADR. Only "réservoir" ("shell") (in German also "Tank") was defined as the sheathing containing the substance.

31. In paragraph 6.6.2.1 of the United Nations Recommendations, under "portable tank", a "citerne" ("tank") was defined as a shell fitted with service equipment and structural equipment. This definition would have the advantage, compared with the ADR definition which was in any case incorrect in respect of the capacity of "1 000 l" for tank-containers and contradictory because of the reference to marginal 200 000 (2), of being easier to apply. The WP.15 Working Party should be requested also to consider the inclusion of this definition in ADR.

32. In German there was an additional difficulty in that there was a single term - "Tank" - for "tank" ("citerne") and "shell" ("réservoir"). The Central Office proposed that the term "Tankwand" should be used for "réservoir/shell"

in the future, for construction requirements concerning the actual sheathing containing the substance. The experts were asked to take a decision in this regard (only the German text was concerned).

6.7.1.1.20

33. The representative of UIP noted that the general requirement of this paragraph referred to liquids having a flashpoint not exceeding 61° C and flammable gases and that it was found as the special requirement TC 2 (for the UN No. 1361 carbon or carbon black) in 6.7.3.1. He therefore proposed to delete the general requirement and to expand the group of substances for which the special requirement TC 2 was applicable to liquids having a flashpoint not exceeding 61° C and to flammable gases.

34. The Chairman explained that there were two codes for tanks carrying liquids for which earthing was not necessary (LGAV and LGBV). All principal and subsidiary risk substances of Class 3 such as carbon and carbon black (UN No. 1361) should be the subject of special requirement TC 2.

35. The representatives of Germany and Belgium commented that provisions should be included as special requirements when the provision in question did not apply to all substances. They therefore supported the UIP proposal only to include a special requirement TC 2 which would, however, be repeated in 6.7.2.6 for gases of Class 2 since in its present position (6.7.3.1) it applied only to substances of Classes 3 to 9.

36. The representative of the Netherlands hoped that the wording of the special requirement, "shells intended for the carriage of liquids having a flashpoint not exceeding 61° C and flammable gases", would be kept so that the regulations would remain comprehensible even without the table.

37. This was contested by the representative of Belgium, since the shipper might have the impression that he still had to check this situation (flashpoint higher than 61° C or flammable gas). He also thought that the special requirements should not have to be specifically explained by class but rather placed at the end of the chapter in order to facilitate the task of finding them.

38. When a vote was taken six delegations voted to keep the requirement in the general section with the addition of the substances carbon and carbon black, UN No. 1361, covered by special requirement TC 2.

39. Where the content of this requirement was concerned, the Chairman explained that it meant two things for rail transport: the establishment of electrical bonding during filling and discharging and the guarantee of a constant driving link in the event of damage to the catenary line or any possible damage by lightning. He argued in favour of keeping the present differences between tank-wagons and tank-vehicles and was supported by eight delegations to one.

6.7.1.1.21

40. The standardization of the text proposed by UIP was accepted.

6.7.1.1.22

41. The texts in their form specific to the modes of transport were kept, as UIP proposed.

6.7.1.1.24

42. For this paragraph, UIP proposed a partial standardization so that a tank diameter of 1.80 m would be regarded as the norm.

43. The representative of the Netherlands thought that such an amendment would be inadvisable since the internal chronology of paragraph 6.7.1.1.24 would depart from that of the following paragraphs.

44. The representative of Germany also proposed that the Working Group should not go ahead with this amendment until a final decision was taken within WP.15 on wall-thickness when alternative materials were used.

45. The UIP proposal was rejected by six delegations to one.

6.7.1.3.1 (Approval of the prototype)

46. The representative of the United Kingdom withdrew his proposal in document C7 and said that he was in favour of that of the representative of Belgium in document C9 since it was a clear graphic representation of what was stated in the last sentence adopted in London (see the report TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1999/1, para.17). The proposal to standardize the UIP text (document C5) had also been adopted. The Working Group had recast the form of the entire text (see document -/1999/5).

47. The additional contribution made to the rationalized approach, on the basis of the proposal by Belgium (C9) made it possible to ascertain, in addition to the substances authorized for a tank code and the other types of tank permitted to carry such substances, the other substances also authorized for carriage in this type of tank which would be permitted in types of tank for which a lower level of performance was required (see the report TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1999/1, para. 16). The representative of the United Kingdom had accordingly made an addition to the rationalized approach of 4.2.4.1.3.

48. A specific illustration of this could be found in paragraph 18 of the report TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1999/1. Other types (codes) of tanks permitted to carry these substances and requiring a higher level of performance should be added.

49. The problem of compatibility (see the report -/1999/1, para.21) had not been resolved and this provision, which had been recast, had been put in square brackets, particularly the word "equally" which the representative of Belgium had wished to keep (document -/1998/39).

50. In the general context of the rationalized approach, the Chairman reminded the meeting that in the explanatory notes all substances would be included in the decision trees (Part 2) in order to facilitate the users' task.

51. The proposal to standardize the text of 6.7.1.3.2 (UIP document C5) had also been adopted (approval for shells constructed without modification, in series or according to a prototype).

Tests, rates of filling and test pressures

52. At the September Joint Meeting, the representative of EIGA had proposed, as for receptacles of Class 2, to include the provisions on the rate of filling and on periodic tests in Part 4 since they concerned the user. In its core documents (-/1998/39 and -/1998/26/Rev.1) UIC proposed to include only the provisions concerning the rate of filling in Class 4, except for gases. In the United Nations Recommendations the test pressure and the rate of filling appeared in Part 4 and the periodic tests in Part 6. It was agreed that there was a link between the test pressure and the rate of filling, at least for gases, that the test pressure, whether for initial or periodic testing, also concerned construction and approval, that the periodic tests concerned both users and authorities and that the initial test should appear in Part 6.

53. It was agreed that, whatever the decision (Part 4 or Part 6), a cross-reference would be inserted as provided for in paragraph 4.2.1.6 of the UIC document.

54. The representatives of France and Belgium proposed that everything should be included in Part 6 and a reference made to Part 6 in Part 4 as a user-friendly gesture. Doing so was justified for all those who needed an overall view of all the requirements.

55. Nine of the ten government delegations supported the proposal by France to include all these provisions in Part 6. The representative of the Netherlands was in favour of Part 4 and the UIP representative abstained.

Conclusion concerning the work on tanks

56. The Chairman noted that there was unanimous satisfaction regarding the decisions on tanks; even the representative of Belgium had given his agreement. The secretariat would prepare consolidated texts for Chapters 6.7 and 4.2 for the Joint Meeting in May.

Agenda item 2 - Packing instructions

57. Owing to the lack of a consolidated text in the working languages on the packing instructions adopted by the United Nations Committee of Experts, the Working Group limited itself to a theoretical discussion of these instructions.

58. The representative of Germany recalled that the packing instructions had been adopted by a majority in the above-mentioned Committee and that reservations had been entered by his Government and by the Netherlands and Belgium. He said, however, that while in principle alignment was an "obligation", the right also existed to diverge on certain points if they were considered unsatisfactory in terms of safety. The United Kingdom in its document C4 also shared this point of view. The representative of Germany

announced that in collaboration with the representative of the United Kingdom he would submit a proposal for a complete text and he asked the representatives of Belgium and the Netherlands if they were prepared to collaborate in this compromise.

59. He also recalled that the United Nations Committee of Experts had not complied with the wish expressed by the Joint Meeting with reference to principle No. 5 of the Recommendations (more stringent requirements and possibilities granted to the transport modes to diverge by means of less stringent requirements) and the RID/ADR divergences could therefore be justified, whether they were more stringent or less so. However, there should be a limit on the topics pending the discussions to be held in IMO.

60. The representative of the United Kingdom explained that, as his document C4 indicated, he could accept divergences provided that they were required for the specific needs of road and rail transport, and that he would tend to adopt a minimalist approach to the exceptions. He agreed to collaborate even if his points of view differed on some issues.

61. The representative of Belgium said that while in 90% of cases agreement had been reached within the Committee of Experts on a compromise he accepted, there had been no desire for discussion in the remaining 10% of cases. He added that transport safety had been neglected in such cases and thus unacceptably reduced. By and large he went along with the reservations of Germany and agreed to collaborate although he considered that an explanatory document should be drafted.

62. The representative of the Netherlands also agreed to collaborate and recalled, as he had already done for the Joint Meeting (INF.15), the need to set out in a document the aspects on which members did not agree, in view of the fact that safety must not be reduced.

63. The representative of France explained that the compromise for which 90% of cases accounted was constructive, since it went both ways. Disagreements were not due to a transport mode but to a different conception of safety in a specific part of the world. The transport modes could be stricter in the principles adopted, but there was a need to concentrate on points of conflict and find good arguments for failure to harmonize. If it was decided to have more stringent instructions than IMO and if the latter's instructions were not deemed to be safe, the logical step would have to be taken to delete marginal 14/2007.

64. The next meeting of the Working Group in Sofia (12 to 16 April) would consider the document to be drafted by Germany and the United Kingdom and would prepare the decisions to be taken by the Joint Meeting in May 1999.

Agenda item 3 - Part 1

65. The Working Group reviewed the decisions of the London small working group on Part 1, on the basis of annex 1 of the London report (-/1999/1), and endorsed the majority of the conclusions it had reached.

66. The Working Group took "tacit" note of the counter-proposals of the secretariat (OCTI) concerning the definitions of radioactive material (including packages), in relation to the decisions of the small working group in paragraph 4. In order to do so the secretariat based itself on the IAEA proposals adopted by the United Nations Committee of Experts (a simple reference to Chapter 2.7, for example).

67. Where paragraph 8 (Marking) was concerned, it was considered necessary to make a distinction between marking which included the UN number and marking on packagings ("marquage"). While this did not pose problems for packages, the situation was not, however, clear where tanks were concerned. The wording should be redrafted so that labelling was not included in the definition of "marking". The problem should be dealt with in relation to Chapter 5.1.

68. The secretariat suggested that, as was the case in the United Nations Recommendations, the definition of "crate" should be included in Part 1, in accordance with the definitions of "tray", "reel" and "receptacle" (Class 1). The problem of the German terminology, which was different in Appendix V/A.5, remained pending, however.

69. The Working Group considered that the question of preparing a definition for "packaging design type" (and "prototype" for tanks) should be referred back to the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts (para. 13).

70. For the definition of "package" (para. 19, No.2) which took account of the definition of "carriage in bulk", the representative of Belgium noted that it was not explicitly stated that the package must carry labels and markings in accordance with the words "ready for dispatch", without which it would not be a package ready for dispatch. He was reminded that these terms were not new in the definition and his attention was drawn to the introductory sentence of marginal 312/2312(1), for example. No account was taken of the comment by the representative of Belgium.

71. The definition of "infrastructure manager" (para. 19, No.7) gave rise to argument. In his document C13 the representative of Germany had stated that the relevant regulations came within national law since, according to 1.8.6.1 in which it was quoted, reports should be submitted to the competent authority of the State in question. He considered that a definition was unnecessary in the circumstances, particularly as there was no definition of railway infrastructure either and some agreement on those terms was needed. The representative of Austria shared his opinion.

72. It was noted that in the context of the revision of COTIF it had been considered necessary to include a definition of "infrastructure manager" in the future Appendix D to COTIF. Since Appendices C (RID) and D were independent of each other and the persons involved in the carriage of dangerous goods could not all be assumed to be familiar with Appendix D, it would be appropriate to refer this question to the RID Committee of Experts for a decision.

Comment by the secretariat: A definition of "railway infrastructure" appears in other appendices and particularly in the future Appendix E* to COTIF with the following wording:

"Railway infrastructure" means all tracks and fixed equipment in so far as they are necessary for the movement of railway vehicles and traffic safety;

"Manager" means the person who makes a railway infrastructure available. A reference could at least be made to these definitions of Appendices D and E.

73. Where paragraphs 12 and 13 of the report itself (-/1999/1) were concerned, and in view of the fact that the UIC leaflet in question had not yet been published and was not yet in force, the Working Group agreed provisionally to include the following provision in 1.4.2.2.1 in square brackets:

"[The provisions of this paragraph shall be deemed to have been met if UIC leaflet ... is applied.]"

74. The definition of "Packing Group" (document -/1998/31/Rev.2) was amended notably to take account of the fact that in the United Nations Recommendations articles were not assigned to a Packing Group, since the packing instructions indicated where necessary which packagings should be used depending on the contents which were the determining factor. The representative of UIC wondered how these packagings could be tested and the representative of Belgium pointed out that, like overpacks, the outer packagings for which the United Nations provided were not outer packagings which had been tested. The representatives of Germany and the United Kingdom were requested to consider this problem in their packing instructions proposal. The definition of "collective entry" was also amended by a reference to 2.1.1.2.

75. In document C8 the secretariat proposed either that Part 1 should include a whole series of definitions of substances for which provision was made in Part 2, or that they should be left in Part 2 and a simple reference made to Part 2 in Part 1. In view of the importance of these definitions for the classification, a reference to Part 1 should also be included in Part 2 if the first option was selected (reference to classification procedures).

76. Without negating the principle adopted at the September Joint Meeting (-/AC.1/74, paras. 106-109), the Working Group decided to include all these definitions both in Part 1 with a reference to Part 2 for classification procedures and in Part 2 because of their importance for classification. In order to justify their inclusion in Part 1 it was pointed out, for example, that organic peroxides were not all substances of Class 5.2 and that the substances concerned were referred to in several sections.

* Appendix E to the Convention - Uniform Rules concerning the contract for the use of the railway infrastructure in international traffic (CIU).

77. The text proposed by the ECE secretariat for the exemptions of 1.1.3.2 and 1.1.3.3 was put in square brackets pending in-depth consideration by the delegations. The representative of UIC wondered why fuel in the tanks of means of transport (marginal 301a(5)) was not included while gases were included. It seemed to emerge from the proposal that exemptions which were difficult to attribute to a United Nations number had been included here, while those that could be attributed were the subject of a special provision in table A of Chapter 3.2 and would be clarified in Chapter 3.3 (see 1.1.3.3).

78. The representative of the United Kingdom asked that it should be specified in the definition of "wagon" that it was "intended to carry only/or principally goods" so as to exclude passenger wagons (coaches). The Chairman said that the question of express parcels and luggage would be settled in Part 7. It would also be possible to come back to this definition in the RID Committee of Experts in the context of piggybacking. The Committee of Experts should also consider in this context modern means of transport (RoadRailer and CargoSprinter, see document -/1999/1, annex 1, para. 19, No. 6) and the problem of "wagon" in the table of 1.1.3.1(c).

79. The Working Group agreed that in Chapter 1.3 (Training of personnel) (see document -/1999/1, annex 1, para. 21) that the decision it had taken at Scheveningen to include the wording of marginal 10 316 (all participants) and not that of marginal 2002(15) (shipper only) should be confirmed. It was suggested that "As regards the training of the safety adviser, see 1.8.3" should be added. It was pointed out in this context that the safety adviser was not responsible for the training of the personnel, since he had no obligation to take charge of training. His work was only to verify.

80. Where the exemptions added to 1.8.3.2 were concerned (Safety adviser, see document -/1999/1, annex 1, para.28), the representative of Belgium entered a reservation since it was a question of national transport operations, and thus of a difference of scope between RID/ADR and the Directive. He considered that (a) applied to RID only, that (b) was unnecessary since ADR did not apply and RID very likely did not apply either, and that (c) was not pertinent to international carriage.

NEXT MEETING AND AGENDA

81. The next meeting (fourteenth) would take place in Sofia from 12 to 16 April 1999. The provisional agenda would include the following items:

1. Tanks, including battery-wagons/battery-vehicles and multiple-element gas-containers ¹
2. Instructions for packagings, IBCs and large packagings
3. Class 7: incorporation of new IAEA provisions ²
4. Part 7 ³
5. Questions of structure relating to Parts 4 to 6.
6. Chapters 3.3 and 3.4 ⁴ (possibly).

Closure of the meeting

82. The Chairman thanked the Polish Railways (PKP) for their warm welcome which had largely contributed to the success of the meeting and to the completion of work on Part 1 and Chapter 6.7 (with the exception of battery-wagons/vehicles and gas-containers).

Notes

1. In order to keep the parallel between the United Nations Recommendations and RID/ADR, the ECE secretariat expressed the wish that no new chapter should be created for this purpose.

It proposed the following:

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Chapters 6.1 to 6.5: | unchanged |
| Chapter 6.6: | large packagings |
| Chapter 6.7: | United Nations portable tanks, and where necessary a simple reference to United Nations Chapter 6.7 |
| Chapter 6.8: | metal tanks of RID/ADR, including battery-wagons/vehicles and gas-containers, and Appendix II.C/B.1d |
| Chapter 6.9: | RID/ADR reinforced plastics tanks |
| and for Part 4: | |
| Chapter 4.2: | use of United Nations portable tanks, where necessary a simple reference or essential provisions |
| Chapter 4.3: | use of RID/ADR metal tanks, including battery-wagons/vehicles and gas-containers |
| Chapter 4.4: | use of RID/ADR reinforced plastics tanks. |

2. The Chairman said that he hoped that with the new requirements the many national special requirements would disappear or be reduced to a strict minimum in view of the difficulties of application they entailed in international traffic.

3. The representative of UIC (Mr. Battista, FS, Istituto Sperimentale) asked delegations to forward their comments on his document on Part 7 (L1) to him.

4. The ECE secretariat is currently preparing the texts.

- - - - -