

# Economic and Social Council

Distr. GENERAL

TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2005/42 7 June 2005

Original: ENGLISH

# 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 (Geneva, 13-23 september 2005)

# HARMONIZATION WITH THE UN RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS

# <u>Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Harmonization of RID/ADR/ADN with the</u> <u>UN Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods \*/</u>

# ATTENDANCE

1. The Ad Hoc Working Group on the Harmonization of RID/ADR/ADN with the UN Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods met in Geneva, Palais des Nations, from 23-25 May 2005 under the chairmanship of Mr. C. Pfauvadel (France).

2. Representatives of France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom, the International Organization for International Carriage by Rail (OTIF), the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine (CCNR) and the European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC) participated in the session.

# **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

3. It was recalled that the Ad Hoc Working Group had been established to review draft proposals prepared by the secretariat for harmonization of RID/ADR/ADN with the fourteenth

<sup>\*/</sup> Circulated by the Central Office for International Carriage by Rail (OCTI) under the symbol OCTI/RID/GT-III/2005/42.

TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2005/42 page 2

revised edition of the UN Recommendations, mainly to avoid lengthy discussions on editorial matters during the forthcoming September session of the Joint Meeting of the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and the RID Safety Committee, and thus to increase the working efficiency of the Joint Meeting. Since participation in the Ad Hoc Working Group session was open to all members of the Joint Meeting and since all Joint Meeting delegations had had the opportunity to provide comments on the proposals, in writing, prior to the session, the Working Group expressed the wish that no discussion on editorial matters would take place during the Joint Meeting session, and that the Joint Meeting discussions would focus on substantial problems of harmonization, if any.

4. As agreed, the session was held in English, without interpretation. The documentation prepared by the secretariat, including the agenda, was issued as informal documents which were made available on the website of the UNECE Transport Division, as follows:

TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/HAR/1: Agenda TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/HAR/2005/1: Proposals for harmonization (UNECE Secretariat) TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/HAR/2005/2: Comments (EIGA)

#### Comments from the OTIF secretariat were also distributed before the meeting

5. The background documents were the report of the UN Economic and Social Council's Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and on the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals and annexes thereto, circulated by the secretariat as documents ST/SG/AC.10/32 and -Adds.1-2.

6. The Ad Hoc Working Group adopted the provisional agenda prepared by the secretariat.

### HARMONIZATION OF RID/ADR/ADN WITH THE UN RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS, MODEL REGULATIONS

7. The draft amendments to RID/ADR/ADN proposed by the Ad Hoc Working Group are reproduced in addendum.1 to this report. The Working Group agreed that the comments below should be brought to the attention of the Joint Meeting and some texts were placed between square brackets for decision by the Joint Meeting.

#### Exemptions for gases (New 1.1.3.2 (h))

8. The Ad Hoc Working Group noted that according to 1.1.3.2 (c), gases of groups A and O other than refrigerated liquefied gases were already exempted if the pressure of the gas in a receptacle or a tank at a temperature of 15 °C did not exceed 200 kPa (2 bar). It was not clear whether the UN Model Regulations exemption for such gases carried at a pressure less than 280 kPa (2.8 bar) at 20 °C would be redundant, in particular because it was not mentioned whether the UN Model Regulations referred to the absolute pressure or to the relative pressure. EIGA should be consulted in this respect, and the new paragraph (h) was placed between square brackets.

#### **Classification of infectious substances**

9. Some questions concerning the interpretation of certain new provisions for classification of infectious substances were raised. The meaning of the word "propagated" in the definition of cultures in 2.2.62.1.3 was questioned, since cultures were normally intended to multiplication of micro-organisms rather than to their propagation. The change from "disease to human or animals" to "disease in otherwise healthy humans or animals" in 2.2.62.1.4.1 seemed to imply that micro-organisms would be considered as category A pathogens only if they were likely to affect healthy persons but that their effect on young, old, sick or immunodeficient persons had not to be taken into account.

10. The representative of Germany said that his Government had some doubts about the scientific soundness of some of these new provisions and that he would submit several proposals of amendments to the September 2005 Joint Meeting session, in particular for the transport of clinical wastes in Europe in relation to the European Waste Catalogue; the classification of several cultures of category A; and Packing Instruction P650. He was invited to submit also his comments to the UN Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods at its July 2005 session, if appropriate.

### **Exemptions of infectious substances**

11. For the new paragraph 2.2.62.1.5.6 (UN Model Regulations paragraph 2.6.3.2.3.6) exempting human or animal specimens for which there is minimal likelihood that pathogens are present, some delegates expressed concern at the fact that, in the absence of clear criteria, the full responsibility of deciding whether such specimens could be exempted would be left to medical practitioners and personnel of laboratories, who would then have also to assume fully the legal consequences in the case of accidents involving a wrong judgment or the use of inappropriate packagings.

12. Some delegates felt that it was not appropriate in legal instruments to specify packing conditions if such conditions were not of a mandatory nature, and that either they should not be included, or they should be included in a note as an example of suitable packing conditions, or they should be made mandatory.

13. Other delegates felt that if packing conditions had to be imposed, these human or animal specimens could not be considered as exempted. Mandatory packing requirements would be equivalent to a kind of new packing instruction when Packing Instructions P620 or P650 could have been required.

14. Finally the Ad Hoc Working Group considered that the Joint Meeting should discuss the three different options indicated in para.12 above.

### Carriage in bulk of wastes of Class 6.2 and of animal carcasses

15. The Ad Hoc Working Group noted that there seemed to be gaps in the UN Model Regulations, as well as in RID/ADR/ADN, for the carriage in bulk of goods of Division 6.2. According to the UN Model Regulations and RID/ADR/ADN, the carriage of UN 2900 in bulk is currently authorized, and additional provisions are provided only for the carriage of wastes of Division 6.2 falling under UN No.2900. This implies that the carriage in bulk of goods of UN No.2900, other than wastes, is also authorized in bulk containers (BK1 and BK2) but without any specific condition. Several delegates considered that this should not be permitted. Others felt that carriage in bulk should be permitted in the same conditions as wastes.

16. In the fourteenth revised edition of the UN Model Regulations, the situation is similar, but in addition the additional provisions for UN No.2900 have been restricted to animal carcasses (UN paragraph 4.3.2.4). The Ad Hoc Working Group felt that they should apply also to other wastes to be classified under UN No.2900, such as contaminated animal "feedstuffs", and corrected the title of paragraph 7.3.2.6 accordingly.

17. The Ad Hoc Working Group noted that the new UN paragraph 4.3.2.4 was intended to apply also to animal carcasses falling under UN No.2814, but that the codes BK1 and BK2 had not been added to column (10) of the List of Dangerous Goods of Chapter 3.2 of the UN Model Regulations. It considered that carriage in bulk of infectious substances falling under UN No. 2814, other than animal carcasses, should not be authorized. Therefore the codes BK1 and BK2 should not be allocated to UN No. 2814, but a second entry for UN No. 2814, covering specifically animal carcasses, could be added to the Dangerous Goods List, with these codes BK1 and BK2.

18. The Ad Hoc Working Group also noted that other animal carcasses, affected by pathogens included in category B, would have to be carried in accordance with provisions determined by the competent authority (UN Model Regulations, paragraph 2.6.3.6.2; RID/ADR/ADN paragraph 2.2.62.1.12.2). Therefore the Joint Meeting may wish to consider whether such animal carcasses should be carried under UN No. 3373, BIOLOGICAL SUBSTANCES, CATEGORY B and under which conditions.

19. The representative of Germany felt that, for animal carcasses, types of containment other than bulk containers should be allowed. He was invited to submit a proposal to the Joint Meeting if he considered it necessary.

#### UN No.3471 Hydrogendifluorides solution, n.o.s.

20. The Ad Hoc Working Group noted that the assignment of tank provisions, either in the UN Model Regulations or in RID/ADR/ADN, was not consistent for liquid substances of Class 8, subsidiary risk 6.1, Packing Groups II and III (RID/ADR/ADN classification code CT1).

For portable tanks, the following tank instructions are assigned to Packing Group II:

T7, TP2 for UN Nos. 1732, 1761, 2922, 3421, 3471, T7, TP2, TP13 for UN No. 2818

T15, TP2, TP13 for UN No. 2030 T8, TP2, TP12 for UN No. 1790 T8, TP2, TP12, TP13 for UN No. 2817.

21. This might be explained by differences in their inhalation toxicity or corrosivity to steel. Nevertheless it was unclear why the conditions applying to CT1 N.O.S. entries (UN Nos 2922 and 3471) are less stringent than those applying to CT1 specific substances for carriage in portable tanks.

22. Similarly, it was unclear why, in RID/ADR/ADN, L4BN is assigned to UN Nos. 1732, 1761, 2030, 2818 and 2922, and L4DH to UN Nos.1790, 2817 and 3421.

23. Therefore the Ad Hoc Working Group could not determine which RID/ADR/ADN tank code should be assigned to UN No. 3471, although some delegations felt that L4DH should be assigned since it is also assigned to other hydrogendifluorides of packing group II and III (UN Nos 2817 and 3421). The Group felt that this question should be discussed by the Working Group on tanks.

# Packing Instruction P204 (UN Nos 1950 and 2037)

24. The Ad Hoc Working Group considered that Packing Instruction P003 could be assigned to UN Nos 1950 and 2037 and Packing Instruction P204 could be deleted because, in P204,

- Paragraph (1) is not relevant for UN No.1950;
- Paragraph (2) is already covered by 4.1.1. and Chapter 6.2;
- Paragraph (3) is covered by P003;.
- For paragraph (4), the Working Group felt that the weight limits could be raised from 50 kg and 75 kg to 55 kg and 125 kg respectively as in the UN Model Regulations and the IMDG Code.
- Paragraph (5) can be covered in a special RID/ADR "RR" packing provision.
- 25. Therefore the Ad hoc Working Group proposes to delete P204 and to amend P003.

#### Waste aerosols

26. The representative of the Netherlands said that he was not in favour of allowing waste aerosols to be carried in accordance with special provision 327 because of the risk of gas leakage, and he drew attention to the fact that this special provision had been placed between square brackets by the Editorial and Technical Group (E and T Group) of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) Sub-Committee on Dangerous Goods, Solid Cargoes and Containers (DSC Sub-Committee).

27. Other delegates said that the E and T Group decision was based on concerns raised by the International Vessel Operators Hazardous Materials Association, Inc. (VOHMA) and the United States of America at the possibility of accumulation of flammable vapours in holds of ships when such waste aerosols are carried in open containers. This issue would be discussed by the DSC Sub-Committee but might be solved through appropriate stowage provisions. These

concerns were not relevant in the case of transport by road or rail, and in practice provisions were needed for the carriage of waste aerosols for the purposes of reprocessing and disposal.

28. The Ad hoc Working Group agreed that such waste aerosols could be carried in open or ventilated wagons, vehicles and containers (Special provision V/W 14) and the representative of the Netherlands was invited to submit an official proposal to the Joint Meeting if he felt that this was not acceptable.

## Marking of pressure receptacles for acetylene

29. The Ad Hoc Working Group noted that the amendment to 6.2.5.8.2 (g) (marking of the mass of the empty receptacle) might have to be taken into account also in 6.2.1.7.2 (f). This should be brought to the attention of the Joint Meeting Working Group on Chapter 6.2.

#### New label for organic peroxides

30. The representative of Spain said that the IMO E and T Group had decided to reproduce the current and the new labels of Model No.5.2 in Chapter 5.2 of the IMDG Code since the two labels could be used during the transitional period until 31 December 2010.

31. The Ad Hoc Working Group was of the view that this would create a precedent since such a practice had never been followed for the many other provisions of RID/ADR for which a transitional period is allowed. In addition, this would not encourage the industry to use the new label as soon as possible.

# Testing of IBCs (paragraph 6.5.6.9.2)

32. The Ad Hoc Working Group noted that there was a mistake in sub-paragraph (c) which should apply not only to rigid plastics IBCs but also to composite IBCs. This mistake should be brought to the attention of the UN Sub-Committee.

#### Dynamic, longitudinal impact test for portable tanks

33. The Ad Hoc Working Group considered that the new test should be required for new portable tanks only and that the use of tanks tested in accordance with the previous requirements should continue to be allowed. Transitional measures should be provided for and might need to be discussed in cooperation with IMO to avoid problems of multimodal transport.

#### General requirements for loading and unloading

34. The Ad Hoc Working Group considered that not all provisions of the new section 7.1.1 of the UN Model Regulations were relevant for inclusion in RID/ADR/ADN, because some of these provisions were already covered in more detail in Part 1 and Chapters 7.2 and 7.5 or other chapters of RID/ADR/ADN. This was the case in particular of UN paragraphs 7.1.1.2, 7.1.1.3, 7.1.1.4 (two first sentences), 7.1.1.9 (two last sentences).

# TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2005/42 page 7

35. The Ad Hoc Working Group considered also that the requirement to comply with loading instructions marked on the package, e.g. orientation arrows, should apply only when such markings are required by RID/ADR/ADN. Other marks, such as "keep dry", are not necessarily linked to transport safety. They may need to be complied with under other legal systems (e.g. contract of carriage) but need to be complied with RID/ADR/ADN only when equivalent requirements are contained therein (e.g. CV23).

36. NOTE 1 to UN paragraph 7.1.1.9 was considered as not relevant since the operational requirements contained in the UN packing instructions are, in RID/ADR/ADN, contained in Part 7 as special provisions V/W or CV/CW.

37. For NOTE 2, the Ad Hoc Working Group noted that the reference to the IMO/ILO/UNECE Guidelines for Packing Cargo Transport Units, which is relevant in the contact of Chapter 5.4 when the road or rail journey precedes a sea voyage, is not necessarily relevant for inland transport since the segregation requirements of the IMDG Code for dangerous goods loaded inside vehicles, wagons and containers are more stringent than those of RID/ADR/ADN. It further noted that as a European Standard was under preparation, it would be more appropriate not to introduce this NOTE 2 until such an adopted standard can be considered rather than to refer to specific modal or national codes of practice for loading.

### Carriage in bulk

38. The Ad Hoc Working Group noted that the 2005 version of RID/ADR/ADN included a definition of bulk containers, which encompasses containers as defined in 1.2.1 but also other types of containers. Nevertheless, the term is not used in Chapter 7.3, which means that only containers and vehicles/wagons as defined in 1.2.1 may be used for carriage in bulk. Therefore the Ad Hoc Working Group recommends to insert the term "bulk container" before the term "containers" whenever this term is are referred to in 7.3.1; and to replace the words "containers" or vehicles/wagons" by "bulk containers" in 7.3.2.

# Segregation distances for radioactive material

39. The OTIF secretariat drew attention to the fact that segregation tables and notes were not included in paragraph 7.1.8.1.1 of the UN Model Regulations (old 7.1.7.1.1) and had been omitted in the proposal for amending 7.5.11, CV 33 (1) (1.1).

40. The Ad Hoc Working Group agreed that these tables should be kept, but class 7 experts should check whether the amendments to paragraphs (a) and (b) (reference to conservative model parameters) would require any change to these RID/ADR/ADN segregation tables notes.

# Use of gas cylinders for the carriage of liquids

41. The Chairman recalled that special packing provisions PR1 to PR7 had been included in 4.1.4.4 of the restructured ADR to reflect the contents of marginals of ADR 99. The new 4.1.3.6 of the fourteenth revised edition of the UN Recommendations contains provisions which may partly cover these special packing provisions but there are also differences between this 4.1.3.6 and existing 4.1.4.4 of RID/ADR. The transitional measures should be added in that case.

42. CEFIC would prefer to keep the text in 4.1.3.6, as adopted by the UN Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, and will provide the Joint Meeting with a table comparing UN 4.1.3.6 and current ADR/RID 4.1.4.4, PR1-PR7. The feeling of CEFIC is that the text of the 14th revised edition of the UN Model Regulations should be adopted.

# ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY THE JOINT MEETING

43. The Joint Meeting is invited to consider the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group and the proposals for harmonization contained in the addendum thereto, and to decide as appropriate.

. . . . . . . . . . . .