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Subject: 5.4.1.1.9 – Attaching the instructions in writing

Proposal transmitted by the Secretariat of OTIF

Introduction

At its meeting in November 2007, WP.15 decided to replace the existing concept of instructions in writing (see report ECE/TRANS/WP.15/194, paragraphs 18 to 22). The proposal was that the instructions in writing, which up to now have related to individual UN Numbers or to groups of UN Numbers, should be replaced by instructions in writing of general validity.

In addition to the four-page model, which applies equally to all dangerous goods, other important amendments that should be mentioned are:

– instead of the consignor, the carrier is now responsible for providing the instructions in writing;

– the instructions in writing are no longer to be provided in all languages of the countries of origin, transit and destination of the consignment, but only in the languages used by the vehicle crew;

– it follows from the previous indent that henceforth, the instructions in writing are aimed only at the vehicle crew and are no longer an aid for the emergency services;

– the instructions in writing must be carried in the vehicle in an easily accessible place in the driver’s cab.
Proposal

5.4.1.1.9  Delete the last sub-paragraph.

Justification

Up to now, RID 5.4.1.1.9 has prescribed that in piggyback transport, the instructions in writing must be attached to the transport document. The reason for this is that up to now, the instructions in writing have been substance-specific and thus have a direct link to the transport document.

According to the new concept, the instructions in writing that apply to all dangerous goods in general only have to be kept in an easily accessible place in the driver’s cab, as they are intended solely for the vehicle driver. The instructions in writing are henceforth to be considered as “a piece of equipment” and no longer as an attachment to the transport document, which is why the requirement in the last sub-paragraph of 5.4.1.1.9 can be deleted.