

OTIF



ORGANISATION INTERGOUVERNEMENTALE POUR
LES TRANSPORTS INTERNATIONAUX FERROVIAIRES

ZWISCHENSTAATLICHE ORGANISATION FÜR DEN
INTERNATIONALEN EISENBAHNVERKEHR

INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATION FOR INTER-
NATIONAL CARRIAGE BY RAIL

INF.19

2 November 2009

Original: French

RID: 47th Session of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods
(Sofia, 16 - 20 November 2009)

Subject: Comments made by UIC and UIRR on informal document INF.11 from Belgium

SUMMARY

- Explanatory Summary:** The proposal from Belgium did not bring any significant improvement to the existing draft, even on safety grounds. On the contrary, it presented additional constraints, as it eliminated part of the decisions endorsed at the last meeting of the RID Committee of Experts held in Hamburg (in 2008).
- Decision to be reached:** Adopting editorial changes in line with those proposed in document OTIF/RID/CE/2009/2.
- Related Documents:** OTIF/RID/CE/2009/2 from the Secretariat, Final report of the 46th session of the RID Committee of Experts (Hamburg, 21-23 October, 2008).

Introduction

1. The issue of piggyback-traffic markings has been subject to an extensive discussion over the last few years. At the 46th session in 2008, UIC presented the results of the work (document OTIF/RID/CE/2008/17) of an informal working group set up to address the marking issue. France, for its part, produced informal document INF.3 aimed at clarifying the vocabulary used to describe the whole variety of piggyback techniques. At the 46th session, it was agreed to set up an ad hoc group tasked with developing a common position based on the individual views expressed by certain States at the session. The Secretariat's proposal in OTIF/RID/CE/2009/2 takes all those views on board and follows up the decisions taken by the RID Committee of Experts.

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.

Comments

2. UIC and UIRR thought that proposals 1 and 2 did not significantly improve the existing text in RID 5.3.1.3.2. Moreover, some existing provisions of ADR had merely been taken over, and 1.1.4.4.4 and 1.1.4.4.5 from the Secretariat's document OTIF/RID/CE/2009/2 had also been copied across. The text was only amended slightly in terms of the language used, without making it any clearer to understand.

In section 2, Belgium observed that "it was a rather peculiar situation to have set requirements specifying what was actually not required". This assertion is not correct: 1.1.4 is about the applicability of other regulations and not a *sui-generis* provision. Such provisions are not unusual: they are drawn, for example, from the existing provisions of RID 5.3.1.3.2 and from those of ADR 1.1.3.6.2.

3. With regard to section 3 of document INF.11, UIC and UIRR consider that the clarification and repetition are not useful. Furthermore, the Belgian document re-states provisions that are already contained in the Secretariat's document (1.1.4.4.4. and 1.1.4.4.5), although it had been agreed at the 46th session to assume that the concept of 'trailer' implicitly included that of 'semi-trailer'.
4. Section 4 is not realistic and the finality of the measure specified in section 9 (proposal 5) is not clearly identifiable. In addition, it provides no obvious safety benefit.

The indication of the total mass of dangerous goods by category is indeed appropriate for carriage by road, as it allows inspection authorities to check whether the exemptions invoked in accordance with 1.1.3.6.2 of ADR are justified. However, this indication is not appropriate for carriage by rail. The fact, for example, that certain provisions of part 8 of ADR are derogated from during a road transport operation has virtually no practical impact on any subsequent rail leg. The data required (for instance the UN number) is already available anyway from alternative information sources, such as transport documents, train composition or wagon lists, EDI systems, etc. In addition, the infrastructure manager has access to this information.

5. Therefore, it was decided 'to accept the road traffic markings as they stood' (section 9 of the OTIF/RID/CE/2008-B report): such an acceptance obviated the need to refer the issue to WP.15 with a view to solving any problem that might arise subsequent to piggyback traffic.
6. Piggyback traffic, as defined at the 46th session of the RID Committee of Experts, covers various transport techniques which do not pose any specific challenges in terms of recognising transport units or vehicles being carried. The existing markings in accordance with ADR and the data available from existing rail traffic information systems are both already available.

Proposal

7. UIC and UIRR urge the RID Committee of Experts to maintain the 'compromise' adopted in 2008, as included in the Secretariat's document (OTIF/RID/CE/2009/2).
