

**OTIF**



**ORGANISATION INTERGOUVERNEMENTALE POUR  
LES TRANSPORTS INTERNATIONAUX FERROVIAIRES**

**ZWISCHENSTAATLICHE ORGANISATION FÜR DEN  
INTERNATIONALEN EISENBAHNVERKEHR**

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATION FOR INTER-  
NATIONAL CARRIAGE BY RAIL**

**OTIF/RID/CE/2006/2**

15 March 2006

Original: French

**RID:** 43<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods  
(Helsinki, 2 – 5 October 2006)

**Subject:** Experts' participation in the exchanges of experience

**Proposal transmitted by Belgium**

### **Summary**

Supplement the last paragraph of 6.8.2.4.6 in order to make it compulsory for experts to participate in the exchange of experiences arranged once a year by OCTI.

### **Introduction**

6.8.2.4.6 sets out the requirements to be observed in order to be considered an expert for performing tests and inspections in accordance with 6.8.2.4.1 to 6.8.2.4.4.

The last paragraph of 6.8.2.4.6 says that the Secretariat of OTIF must arrange an exchange of experiences between the approved experts at least once every year in order to introduce and develop harmonised test and inspection procedures and to ensure a uniform level of inspections. So far, Germany has arranged the meeting to exchange experiences 3 times (in accordance with multilateral agreement RID 4/2002); this meeting had to be cancelled twice in view of the small number of experts who said they would attend.

At the RID Committee of Experts' session in November 2005 in Madrid, Belgium suggested that participation by approved experts be prescribed as mandatory. Seven delegations supported this idea (see paragraph 45 of report A 81-03/501.2006).

For reasons of cost, only a limited number of copies of this document have been made. Delegates are asked to bring their own copies of documents to meetings. OTIF only has a small number of copies available.

We should like to point out that a working group is at present dealing with the introduction of the principles of the TPED into RID/ADR, particularly the requirements for inspection bodies and the international mutual recognition of experts. However, at the moment it is not easy to anticipate whether the work of this group will in 2009 deliver results including tanks for all classes or only for receptacles and tanks of Class 2.

For this reason, Belgium is submitting this document, although it is aware that in the long term, 6.8.2.4.6 will probably be deleted and encompassed by the new principles on which the working group referred to above is working.

## **Proposal**

Add the following to the last sub-paragraph of 6.8.2.4.6:

“The [experts/inspection bodies] approved in accordance with this paragraph are, in principle, required to participate in this exchange of experiences. If an [expert/inspection body] does not participate in the exchange of experiences, the competent authority may withdraw his/its approval.”

## **Justification**

In view of the importance of developing harmonised inspection procedures and to ensure a uniform level of inspections (particularly from the perspective of international mutual recognition, but also to ensure an identical level of safety for all tank-wagons, whatever the country in which they are approved), it is essential that the experts co-operate with each other, especially in the context of the annual exchange of experiences.

The words “in principle” were included in the sentence in order to anticipate the case where a body might have a valid reason for not participating in the meeting.

Prescribing that the competent authority **may** withdraw approval from a body that does not participate in the exchange of experiences gives the competent authority the possibility of putting pressure on bodies to participate, while anticipating cases where a body has a good reason not to participate and commits itself, for example, to noting the results of the meeting and to apply the decisions taken at the meeting. In this case, the competent authority may decide that the body can keep its approval despite not taking part in the meeting.

The words **[experts/inspection bodies]** have been placed in square brackets because it is in fact one participant from each approved body who must participate in the meeting and not every expert who performs inspections. On the other hand though, Chapter 6.8 always refers to approved **experts**. We think it would be interesting to have a discussion on the use of these terms.

---