



Organisation intergouvernementale pour les transports internationaux ferroviaires
Zwischenstaatliche Organisation für den internationalen Eisenbahnverkehr
Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail

OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2016-B

19 January 2017

Original: German

**TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE MEMBER STATES OF OTIF AND
TO REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS WHICH HAVE ACCEDED TO COTIF**

**Final report of the 7th session of the RID Committee of Experts'
standing working group**

(Prague, 22 - 24 November 2016)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Paragraphs	Page
ITEM 1: Approval of the agenda	1	3
ITEM 2: Presence	2 – 3	3
ITEM 3: Interpretation of RID	4 – 20	3
ITEM 4: Proposals to amend RID	21 – 37	6
A. Pending issues	21 – 24	6
B. New proposals	25 – 37	6
ITEM 5: Harmonisation of RID and SMGS Annex 2	38 – 45	8
ITEM 6: Information from the European Union Agency for Railways (ERA)	46 – 59	9
ITEM 7: Any other business	60 – 89	11
Annex I:	Texts adopted by the 7 th session of the RID Committee of Experts' standing working group	
Annex II:	List of participants	

ITEM 1: Approval of the agenda

Document: RID-16007-CE-GTP7 (Secretariat)

Informal document: INF.1 (Secretariat)

1. The meeting adopted the provisional agenda set out in the invitation letter RID-16007-CE-GTP7 dated 16 September 2016, with the list of documents published by the Secretariat in informal document INF.1.

ITEM 2: Presence

2. The following RID Contracting States took part in the work of the 7th session of the standing working group (see also Annex II):

Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine and the United Kingdom.

Russia took part as an OTIF Member State which does not apply RID.

The European Commission, the European Union Agency for Railways (ERA) and the Organization for Cooperation of Railways (OSJD) were also represented.

The following non-governmental international organisations were represented: The European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC), the International Union of Railways (UIC), the International Union of Wagon Keepers (UIP) and the International Union of Combined Road-Rail Transport Companies (UIRR).

3. At the 6th session of the standing working group, Mrs Caroline Bailleux (Belgium) was elected as the chair until further notice and Mr Colin Bonnet (Switzerland) was elected as the deputy chair.

ITEM 3: Interpretation of RID

Entry into force of a Polish law to indicate the owner of the dangerous goods in documents in accordance with RID Chapter 5.4

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2016/9 (UIC)

Informal documents: INF.6, paragraphs 37 to 43 (Secretariat)
INF.14 (Poland)

4. In its document 2016/9, UIC referred to the entry into force of a Polish law that requires the owner of the dangerous goods to be entered in the documents in accordance with RID Chapter 5.4. UIC raised a question of interpretation as to whether, bearing in mind the provisions of Article 3 RID and Article 1, paragraph 5 of Directive 2008/68/EC, this law also applied to international transport to or through Poland. The question was also raised as to whether, in view of the provisions of Directive 2008/68/EC, it was permissible to make carriers in Polish rail freight transport responsible for information on the owner of the dangerous goods not being included in the transport document.
5. Paragraphs 37 to 43 of the Secretariat's informal document INF.6 set out the discussion on a similar document from the International Road Transport Union (IRU) at the last session of WP.15 (Geneva, 8 to 10 November 2016).

6. In informal document INF.14, Poland provided more clarification on document 2016/9 and informal document INF.6.
7. The representative of the European Commission noted that the European Commission had not been notified of this Polish law. He explained that the European Commission would carry out an analysis, including checks to ensure that there was no obstacle to the free movement of goods. Several delegates asked the representative of the European Commission to put this document on the agenda of the next meeting of the EU Dangerous Goods Regulatory Committee (Brussels, 12 December 2016).
8. The representative of CEFIC referred to difficulties in the practical implementation of this law. The International Commercial Terms (Incoterms), which govern buyers' and sellers' rights in international goods trading, said nothing about the transfer of ownership. It might be the case that the information in the transport document at the time the dangerous goods are handed over for carriage no longer reflects the reality during transport because the seller has received payment in the meantime.
9. The representative of Germany added that the question of the owner was difficult to answer when returning empty, uncleaned tank-wagons.
10. Several delegations said that this law was disproportionate, as it was supposed to help combat the black market in a few UN numbers (liquid fuels), but affected all dangerous goods and hence all UN numbers.
11. The representatives of Austria and Switzerland noted that this was **not a dangerous goods provision that had been incorporated into the Polish dangerous goods legislation. This also fitted in with the Polish government's assertion that a breach of this provision could not be punished in accordance with dangerous goods law. Therefore, the** standing working group was not the correct forum to interpret provisions outside the dangerous goods legislation.
12. Several delegations were of the view that **in principle**, Article 3 of Appendix C and Article 1 § 5 of Directive 2008/68/EC gave Member States the right to enact laws for reasons other than those of safety, **but also pointed out that such a measure would lead to the practical problems referred to and hence would constitute an obstacle to the free movement of goods.**
13. **The** Secretariat of OTIF **also** pointed out that according to Article 31 § 1 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, "a treaty shall be interpreted in good faith in the light of its object and purpose". The aim of the technical provisions of RID was to avoid, as far as possible, personal injury and damage to property and the environment in the carriage of dangerous goods. The main aim of the transport document was therefore to provide essential information concerning the hazards arising from the dangerous goods being carried. If the reasons for a national law did not concern safety, **a law in terms of Article 3 of Appendix C would** then at least have to have some connection with the risks arising from the dangerous goods. It was at least questionable whether there was any connection between stemming the black market in fuels and the hazard arising from the dangerous goods.
14. The representative of Poland thanked the meeting for the comments and confirmed that all these questions and comments would be analysed.

Obligations of freight terminal operators as participants in the carriage of dangerous goods

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2016/10 (Spain)

15. In document 2016/10, the representative of Spain raised the question of the obligations that are incumbent upon rail freight terminal operators in accordance with RID **when they move wagons within the terminal or from the terminal to external facilities close to the terminal, such as ports, factories or private sidings.**
- 15a. **The representative of UIC highlighted that according to the definition of carriage, RID applies from when carriage begins and 1.4.2.2.1 does not prescribe where on the railway infrastructure the inspection before the departure should take place.**
16. The Chair explained that according to its Article 1 § 1 d), Directive 2008/68/EC did not apply to transport "wholly performed within the perimeter of an enclosed area", so in principle, only the interface between the public network and the terminal would have to be considered.
17. The representative of Germany explained that three legal areas were concerned; general railway law, environmental law (Seveso Directive 2012/18/EU), which Directive 2008/68/EC said applied when dangerous goods law was not applied in enclosed areas, and dangerous goods law. The latter was applicable in the case of a publicly accessible terminal. In this case, the terminal operator's contractual arrangements would have to specify who the carrier was and who had to carry out the carrier's obligations.
18. The representative of ERA pointed out that a general interpretation was difficult because it would depend on whether **the State concerned had excluded a terminal from the scope of application when transposing the Safety Directive 2004/49/EC into national law.**
- 18a. **The representative of the United Kingdom pointed out that according to RID 1.2.1, 1.4.1 and 1.4.2.2.5, it was not necessarily only rail freight terminal operators that should be considered within the RID definition of the term "carrier". Nevertheless, the competent authority is enabled to ensure that the specific responsibilities are clearly set out for those involved.**
- 18b. **The representative of the Netherlands was of the opinion that the responsibility of carriers and other participants is clear in Chapter 1.4 of RID. Only when carriage takes place exclusively within enclosed areas and has no origin or destination outside a terminal does RID not apply.**
- 18c. **The representative of Spain thanked participants for their contributions to the discussion of the document and recalled that several delegations had indicated that the definition of "carrier" is not equivalent to "railway undertaking" and that these differences should be taken into account when resolving the issue raised by Spain.**

Entry into force of the new directive on railway safety (Directive 2016/798/EU)

Informal document: INF.9 (UIC)

19. The standing working group noted UIC's informal document INF.9, which provided information about a document to be submitted to the next meeting of the EU Dangerous Goods Regulatory Committee (Brussels, 12 December 2016). This document explained the consequences of the new rail safety directive (2016/798/EU) on the obligations of carriers, infrastructure managers and other participants within the meaning of RID Chapter 1.4.
20. The representative of ERA explained that the questions were partly addressed in informal document INF.13. As the safety directive did not lay down any new requirements, he saw no **direct** need for **consequential** amendments to RID.

ITEM 4: Proposals to amend RID

A. Pending issues

Draft list of corrections to the notification texts OTIF/RID/NOT/2017 and to the 2017 edition of RID

Informal document: INF.4 (Secretariat)

21. The standing working group approved the corrections set out in informal document INF.4 concerning the notification texts OTIF/RID/NOT/2017 and the printed edition of RID 2017, with an additional amendment to the French version of 6.8.2.4.3.¹

Texts adopted by the 101st session of WP.15 (Geneva, 8 - 10 November 2016)

Informal document: INF.6 (Secretariat)

22. The standing working group noted informal document INF.6 setting out the most important results of the last session of WP.15.
23. As a supplement to paragraphs 18 to 20 of informal document INF.6 (Presentation of the EuroMed project), the Secretariat informed the meeting that the Secretariat of OTIF was involved in a parallel EuroMed project for rail transport and against this background, it had taken part in events in Egypt, Israel and Tunisia in order to provide information on RID and the work of the standing working group, among other matters.

Informal working group on check-lists for the filling and emptying of liquefied gas tank-wagons

Informal document: INF.8 (Italy)

24. The standing working group noted informal document INF.8, which reported the findings of the informal working group on check-lists for the filling and emptying of liquefied gas tank-wagons, which met on 27 and 28 October 2016 in Milan. The representative of Italy asked delegates to send him any comments and suggestions by the end of February 2017. He said he would be ready to host a final meeting in spring 2017 to finalise the proposal to the standing working group.

B. New proposals

Entering the hazard identification number in the transport document

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2016/6 (Switzerland)

25. On the basis of his document, the representative of Switzerland explained that according to the definition in 1.2.1, "UN number" only meant the four digit number without the letters "UN". This led to misunderstandings when entering the hazard identification number in the transport document in accordance with 5.4.1.1.1 (j). In the document, Switzerland proposed using the "letters UN" instead of the "UN number" in 5.4.1.1.1 (j).
26. The representative of Poland pointed out that the same wording was also used in 1.1.4.4.5, so this paragraph would also have to be amended.

¹ Note by the Secretariat: The final versions of these two lists of corrections were sent to the Member States with circular RID-16008-CE54 of 30 November 2016 concerning the entry into force of the 2017 amendments to RID.

27. The standing working group adopted the amendment proposed by Switzerland, with a clarification to the text for 1.1.4.4.5 and 5.4.1.1.1 (j) proposed orally by the Netherlands (see Annex I). A correction to the English wording of the second sentence of 5.4.1.1.1 (j) proposed by the United Kingdom was also adopted (see Annex I).

Clarification of the wording in 5.4.1.1.1 (j)

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2016/7 (Czech Republic)

28. In its document, the Czech Republic proposed an addition to 5.4.1.1.1 (j) to do away with the hazard identification number in the transport document in cases where the wagon is not marked with orange-coloured plates.
29. Several delegations rejected the proposed addition, saying that the hazard identification number could also provide useful additional information, even in cases where no orange-coloured plates were prescribed or affixed. For example, this would be the case in the carriage of containers, tank-containers, portable tanks, MEGCs and wagons marked in accordance with the IMDG Code.
30. In the additional text proposed, the Chair suggested replacing the words "shall not" by "need not". This would mean that it is not necessary to inscribe the hazard identification number, but it would not be prohibited to do so either.
31. If the Czech Republic's proposal only referred to the second sentence of 5.4.1.1.1 (j), the representative of the United Kingdom proposed that to make matters clearer, this paragraph should be divided into two sub-paragraphs and the part of the text proposed by the Czech Republic should only be added to the second sub-paragraph.
32. The Chair invited the Czech Republic to submit a revised proposal to the next session of the standing working group. Standing working group participants were asked to send their comments to the representative of the Czech Republic.

Inclusion of nitrogen, compressed (UN 1066) as a protective agent in 5.5.3

Informal document: INF.2 (Russian Federation)

33. In its informal document, the Russian Federation proposed to extend the scope of 5.5.3 to substances which present a risk of asphyxiation and which are used as protective agents. As an example, the Russian Federation referred to UN 1066 Nitrogen, compressed.
34. Most delegations saw no need to refer explicitly to the substances used as protective agents, because use as a protective agent could be subsumed under use for conditioning purposes.
35. The representative of the United Kingdom pointed out that UN 1066 nitrogen, compressed, was not listed in the heading of 5.5.3. He also said it would be useful to have more information on the hazards in relation to the quantity of compressed nitrogen usually used as a protective agent in practice.
36. The Chair pointed out that any amendment to 5.5.3 would first have to be decided at UN level, and asked the Russian Federation to submit a revised proposal to the UN Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, taking into account the comments made.

Harmonisation of the abbreviation for intermediate bulk containers in the Russian text of the international dangerous goods regulations

Informal document: INF.3 (Russian Federation)

37. The standing working group noted the Russian Federation's proposal to harmonise the abbreviation for intermediate bulk containers in the Russian text of RID/ADR/ADN and the UN Model Regulations with SMGS Annex 2 and the English text, and asked the Russian Federation to submit the proposal to the UN Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods.

ITEM 5: Harmonisation of RID and SMGS Annex 2

Decisions of the OSJD Commission for Transport Law

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2016/11 (Latvia)

38. With the help of his document, the representative of Latvia informed the standing working group of the decisions of the OSJD Commission for Transport Law in the area of requirements for the carriage of dangerous goods, which took place on 6 and 7 October 2016 in Warsaw. At the previous session of the Group of Experts, the Russian Federation had already entered a reservation against using references to EU directives and EN standards in SMGS Annex 2, and it had maintained this rejection at the meeting of the OSJD Commission. As the proposed amendments to SMGS Annex 2 formed a unit, it had been decided to vote on all the amendments en bloc. The Russian Federation was the only country that voted against the amendments. As the organs of OSJD worked on the principle of unanimity, all the 2017 amendments to SMGS Annex 2 had been rejected.
39. The Secretariat explained that at the annual meeting between OSJD and OTIF on 21 October 2016 in Warsaw, the OTIF Secretariat had pointed out the negative consequences of not adopting the 2017 amendments to SMGS Annex 2. In particular, the Secretariat had drawn attention to the fact that following the introduction of new UN numbers for engines, some difficulties were anticipated, because from 1 July 2017, these would have to be carried as dangerous goods in the RID legal area. For example, when these goods moved from the RID legal area into the geographical scope of SMGS Annex 2, all the markings relating to dangerous goods would have to be removed. In the Russian Federation, this situation would arise in rail transport, but not in road transport, as the Russian Federation had not lodged any objections to the 2017 amendments to ADR. The disparate provisions for rail and road would lead to problems in multimodal transport.
40. One possible solution to this unwelcome situation had been raised at the meeting between OSJD and OTIF: the meeting of OSJD's temporary working group on SMGS Annex 2 in February 2017 could be replaced by a meeting of the Group of Experts on SMGS Annex 2 and a subsequent meeting of the OSJD Commission for Transport Law. At that meeting, the OSJD Commission could take a new decision on adopting the 2017 amendments to SMGS Annex 2 and ensure that the amendments enter into force on time on 1 July 2017. It was pointed out that the decision to hold a meeting of the OSJD Commission for Transport Law in February 2017 would have to be taken by the Conference of the plenipotentiary representatives of the OSJD members, which was to be held from 6 to 9 December 2016 in Warsaw.
41. In order to prevent the impending problems for transport between the two legal regimes and for multimodal transport in the OSJD States, the representative of Latvia asked those States that were also members of OSJD to support the proposed action at the December meeting of the Conference of plenipotentiary representatives of the OSJD members.

References to EN standards in the text of SMGS Annex 2

Informal document: INF.10 (Russian Federation)

42. The representative of the Russian Federation explained that only a few OSJD States were involved in the process of developing EN standards and EU directives. This was one of the reasons why the Russian Federation would prefer to have references to globally applicable ISO standards in SMGS Annex 2, rather than references to regional documents (EN standards and EU directives).
43. The representative of the Russian Federation pointed out in particular that the EN standards covered important aspects of the carriage of gases, but that it could not be assumed that these standards covered the whole range of issues. Even more pressingly, there was the question as to how they could be integrated into the global transport of dangerous goods.
44. Apart from this, the Russian Federation said that following a few editorial and other amendments to the references to standards, it was prepared to support the entry into force of the 2017 amendments to SMGS Annex 2 on 1 July 2017.
45. The Chair pointed out that for RID/ADR experts, it was the technical content of the standards that was important, rather than their origin. She also invited the Russian Federation to propose more suitable standards for liquefied gas cylinders to the RID/ADR/ADN Joint Meeting. She thanked the Russian Federation for its desire to help resolve the situation and on behalf of the standing working group, she hoped that a solution could be found as quickly as possible so that harmonisation of the two sets of regulations could also be ensured in future.

ITEM 6: Information from the European Union Agency for Railways (ERA)

Scope of the ECM certificate

46. The Chair referred to paragraph 33 of the report of the 6th session of the standing working group (document OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2016-A), which asked delegations to ascertain at their national certification bodies whether, in the scope of the ECM certificate, it was still necessary to distinguish between dangerous goods tank-wagons and other specialised dangerous goods wagons.
47. Three delegations gave their views on this question. Two of them saw no need to differentiate and one of them thought it would be useful to differentiate for reasons of statistical surveys.
48. The representative of ERA reminded the meeting that the ECM certificate was a component of the ECM Regulation, which was currently in the process of being revised. As the question of the need to differentiate **was a matter for coordination between dangerous goods law and general railway law**, he asked participants to send the Secretariat their responses to this question by the end of January 2017, supported, as far as possible, by justification. In so doing, it was also important to assess whether ECMs should be subject to different requirements depending on the type of wagon.

Information from the European Union Agency for Railways (ERA)

Informal document: INF.12 (ERA)

49. The standing working group noted the information contained in informal document INF.12 submitted by ERA.
50. The representative of Austria was surprised by the new obligations to report safety issues (see paragraphs 15 to 28 of informal document INF.12), which deliberately circumvented the authorities and constituted a sort of market monitoring exclusively by those participating in the market. As he was not aware of such models in the other transport modes, particularly in air transport, he asked the representative of ERA whether there were already any working examples for this. The representative of ERA explained that this had been discussed with the railways in view of the 4th Railway Package of the European Union and in this context, the experiences of other European Union agencies, such as EASA, had also had an influence.
51. The representative of ERA added that despite what was said in paragraph 24 of informal document INF.12, the Member States could still provide comments. He emphasised how important it was that members of the standing working group could contribute, where necessary, to relevant ERA consultations.
52. The Chair reminded the meeting that participants of the standing working group could approach the representative of ERA to obtain access to ERA's extranet.

Guidelines concerning the use of derailment detectors

Informal documents: INF.11 (ERA)
INF.7 (Italy)

53. In introducing his informal document INF.11, the representative of ERA emphasised that the guidelines that had been developed were fully in line with the decisions of the working group on derailment detection. At the invitation of the Chair, he confirmed that this document constituted information from ERA and not a proposal, as it only reflected in a simplified manner the applicable European Union legislation. He pointed out that the report of the working group on derailment detection had not stipulated that these guidelines had to be developed together with the Member States.
54. Several delegations regretted that there had been no opportunity to examine the document, which had only been made available one week before the meeting. For this reason, the representative of Germany entered an official reservation.
55. The representative of Italy did not believe that the proposed guidelines reflected the decisions taken by the working group on derailment detection, because they were not a useful working document for the assessment of these devices. He did not agree with the document presented by ERA and anticipated that a detailed request for improvement would be sent in few weeks, and he reserved the right to raise the question with the European Commission. The representative of the Netherlands had the impression that the guidelines did not fully reflect the conclusions of the working group on derailment detection. The representative of Switzerland had the impression that the document only described the risks, which could lead people to refrain from using derailment detectors. He reminded the meeting that there had not yet been any incidents in which a false alarm by a derailment detector had led to a dangerous outcome. He asked how the users of derailment detectors could undertake a risk assessment when it had not been possible during the years of discussions on derailment detection to quantify this risk.

56. The representative of UIC thought the term "user" in the document should be made clearer. For example, the person who decided to equip a wagon with derailment detectors could not be considered as a user. The same applied to the consignor of dangerous goods who, in his transport order, requests that derailment detectors be used.
57. The representative of ERA recalled the urgent nature of the guidelines, **as concluded by the working group on derailment detection**, because it was not possible to publish TSIs in a short timescale. He conceded that this document could be improved, **notably by checking the applicability of the guidelines to non-EU Member States**, and asked participants to inform him of any specific requests for improvement.² The **potential** users of derailment detectors should be informed of these guidelines.

Answers to questions raised by Belgium

Informal document: INF.13 (ERA)

58. In informal document INF.13, ERA gave its views on various questions Belgium had raised in the context of the regular information provided by ERA. The questions concerned the impact of the TSIs on the carriage of dangerous goods.
59. The representative of ERA asked participants to ensure that there was better national coordination so that dangerous goods aspects could also be taken into account when drafting TSIs. Aspects that only concerned the carriage of dangerous goods **should not be discussed in the TSI working party without prior coordination with the standing working group. This coordination was currently being discussed in the RID/ATMF working group.**

ITEM 7: Any other business

Derailment of a freight train in Daillens (Switzerland) on 25 April 2015

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2016/8 (Switzerland)

60. The representative of Switzerland informed the standing working group of the findings of the accident investigation report on the railway accident in Daillens. On 25 April 2015, a freight train carrying dangerous goods derailed in Daillens. Four wagons overturned and were damaged and dangerous goods leaked out (sulphuric acid, caustic soda). The direct cause of the derailment was the loss of an axle box on one of the subsequently overturned wagons.
61. In its report, the Swiss Safety Investigation Service issued several safety recommendations. The standing working group agreed that owing to the cause of the accident and the nature of the safety recommendations, the bodies responsible for railway technology should deal with the report.
62. At the request of Switzerland, the standing working group discussed one of the report recommendations concerning the railway infrastructure manager's responsibility to check his network for any protruding elements situated near the tracks (track measuring points in this case) that might damage a tank in the event of an accident, and to remove them.
63. The standing working group did not support an addition to the infrastructure manager's obligations listed in RID 1.4.3.6 and expressed doubt as to whether the standing working group was the right forum for this issue.

² **Note by the Secretariat:** On 13 December 2016, ERA sent these guidelines to the National Safety Authorities and the National Representative Bodies for consultation. The deadline for replies was 6 February 2017.

64. In reply to the question from several delegations as to the competent forum, the representative of ERA replied that if there were problems in connection with the railway infrastructure, the European legislation required the infrastructure manager to carry out a risk analysis. Only he could then decide, based on the findings of the risk analysis, which measures might be necessary.
65. The Chair suggested that the national authorities should make infrastructure managers aware of the problems with protruding elements noted by Switzerland. She also pointed out that the investigation report should also be used to make participants aware of the correct use of salvage tank-wagons in emergency situations.

Railway accident in Tilburg (Netherlands) on 6 March 2015

Informal document: INF.5 (Netherlands)

66. The representative of the Netherlands informed the standing working group of a railway accident that had occurred on 6 March 2015 in Tilburg and of the safety recommendations resulting from the investigation of this accident made by the Dutch Safety Board.
67. In the accident, a passenger train passed a signal at red and collided with the last tank-wagon containing dangerous goods of a stabled freight train. The tank-wagon was not fitted with devices to protect against the overriding of buffers or to limit damage in the event of overriding of the buffers.
68. Among other things, the recommendations of the Dutch Safety Board included extending the scope of special provision TE 25 to all tank-wagons for the carriage of dangerous goods and the requirement that the last wagon of a freight train may not contain any dangerous goods.
69. The representatives of Austria and France **pointed out that the investigation report highlighted a range of irregularities and safety gaps that had led to the accident. They were therefore of the view** that the focus should be on measures to avoid **them**, rather than measures to limit the consequences of accidents. **In addition, they doubted** that the measures described would be effective.
70. The representative of the United Kingdom drew attention to the negative consequences of the proposed measures. The measure to protect against the overriding of buffers would inevitably lead either to a lower quantity of dangerous goods being carried in each wagon, or longer trains. This would then result in higher costs and an economic disadvantage for rail transport compared with road transport. Implementing the proposed train composition measure would lead to an increase in shunting manoeuvres and hence increase the potential risks.
71. The Chair reminded the meeting that the second session of the standing working group (Copenhagen, 18 to 22 November 2013) had already considered the risks of train composition following the accident in Godinne in Belgium (11 May 2012) (see also report OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2013-A, paragraphs 108 to 109). When the accident investigation report was being prepared, the Belgian infrastructure manager had analysed the available statistics and classified the measures relating to train composition as inexpedient.
72. When following up the measures recommended by its Safety Board, the Dutch delegation was asked to take account of the economic efficiency, additional risks and relevant discussions that had already taken place in the RID Committee of Experts and its standing working group.

Risk reduction measures for chlorine imports into Switzerland

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2016/12 (Switzerland)

73. Based on his document, the representative of Switzerland informed the standing working group of the measures set out in a Common Declaration II for imports of chlorine into Switzerland. Common Declaration II was jointly drafted and signed by representatives of the chemical industry, the loading industry, Swiss Railways, the Federal Office of Transport and the Federal Office for the Environment.
- 73a. The representative of CEFIC explained that because of the small quantities required, producing chlorine on-site was uneconomic.
74. Several delegations raised questions concerning the international compatibility of these measures, particularly with regard to interoperability. The representative of Switzerland assured participants that **based on the current risk assessment**, transit traffic through Switzerland was not affected by these measures. Moreover, all these measures were only mandatory for the signatories to Common Declaration II.
75. In reply to the question of whether implementation of the first measure (obtaining chlorine from Italy rather than France) would not simply shift the risk elsewhere, the representative of Switzerland said that this way, the overall risk would be reduced, because the distance travelled would be shorter and built-up areas could be avoided.
76. The representative of Switzerland acknowledged one objection raised by the representative of ERA, that cost savings by the economically powerful chemical industry **should not be at the expense of** the economically weak rail transport mode, **and** pointed out that the measures that had been agreed would result in increased transport costs, which, in turn, would have to be borne by the chemical industry.
77. The representative of UIC drew attention to the fact that carrying chlorine exclusively in train-load consignments could also lead to the risk being transferred, depending on where the train was composed.
78. The representative of ERA pointed out that in future, for the transport of chlorine, Switzerland should apply the harmonised risk assessment method ERA **is developing via the workshops it is hosting on risk management for the inland transport of dangerous goods**. In addition, non-harmonised national agreements should be avoided as far as possible, in order not to jeopardise the interoperability of European rail traffic.
79. If it were found that the proposed measures should also be established generally for the international carriage of chlorine, Switzerland offered to submit the appropriate proposals to the standing working group.

Information from the Secretariat – new design for OTIF’s website

80. The Secretariat informed the standing working group that OTIF’s website had been redesigned. In addition to the new design, the new website, which was to be on line on 1 December 2016, would also provide new functions. One of the new functions would enable the most recently published documents on the website to be called up. The Secretariat therefore proposed that in future, delegates should no longer be sent the meeting documents by e-mail. However, the calling notice would continue to be sent by e-mail.
81. The standing working group welcomed the new design of OTIF’s website and had no objections to no longer receiving documents by e-mail, but asked for a one month transitional period.

Farewells

82. Mr Stanislav Hájek (Czech Republic) began his career at the Czechoslovakian State Railways, where he worked in almost every field. He will finish his professional career at the Czech Office for Railways in the first half of 2017.
83. Mr Steen Riis Thomsen (Denmark) began his career as a locomotive driver with the Danish State Railways, before being given responsibility for the Danish edition of RID. This meeting of the standing working group brought his professional career to a close.
84. Mr Bo Zetterström (Sweden), who is a chemist by profession, worked in the transport of dangerous goods field since 1994 and was Sweden's delegate to the RID Committee of Experts since 2007. He will retire in spring 2017.
85. The Chair thanked Mr Stanislav Hájek, Steen Riis Thomsen and Bo Zetterström for their many years of active participation in the work of the RID Committee of Experts and its standing working group. She also pointed out that all three had organised meetings of the RID Committee of Experts in their own countries, and all of those who had been at those meetings had fond memories of them. On behalf of the standing working group, she wished them all the best for a long, healthy and happy retirement.

Thanks

86. The Chair thanked the Czech delegation for the excellent organisation of the meeting and the pleasant evening the group had spent together.
87. The Chair thanked the Secretariat for the good preparation of the documents, which had considerably simplified the chairmanship of this meeting. She thanked the interpreters for their important contribution to the successful running of the meeting. Lastly, she thanked the plenary for its active participation.
88. On behalf of all the delegates, the representative of Switzerland thanked the Chair for her excellent leadership of the meeting and congratulated her on her successful début as Chair.

Next session

89. The 8th session of the RID Committee of Experts' standing working group will be held in the Netherlands in the week from 20 to 24 November 2017.
-

Texts adopted by the 7th session of the RID Committee of Experts' standing working group

PART 1**Chapter 1.1****1.1.4.4.5** Amend the end to read as follows:

"..., the hazard identification number shall be entered in the transport document before the letters "UN" preceding the UN number (see 5.4.1.1.1 (a))."

[Reference document: OTIF/RID/CE/GT/2016/6, as amended]

PART 5**Chapter 5.4****5.4.1.1.1** In paragraph (j), amend the end of the first sentence to read as follows:

"..., the hazard identification number shall also be inscribed before the letters "UN" preceding the UN number (see paragraph (a))."

[Reference document: OTIF/RID/CE/GT/2016/6, as amended]

In paragraph (j), in the second sentence, after "substance", insert:

"or article".

Liste des participants
List of participants
List of participants

I. États parties au RID/RID-Vertragsstaaten/RID Contracting States

Allemagne/Deutschland/Germany

Mr Alfons **Hoffmann**
Mr Benjamin **Körner**
Mr Frank **Jochems**

Autriche/Österreich/Austria

Mr Othmar **Krammer**

Belgique/Belgien/Belgium

Ms Caroline **Bailleux**

Croatie/Kroatien/Croatia

Mr Branko **Mikulić**

Danmark/Dänemark/Denmark

Ms Bolette **Daugaard**
Mr Steen Riis **Thomsen**

Espagne/Espanien/Spain

Mr Luis **del Prado Arévalo**

Finlande/Finnland/Finland

Mr Jouni **Karhunen**
Ms Pirjo **Ranta**

France/Frankreich/France

Mr Michel **Korhel**

Italie/Italien/Italy

Mr Benedetto **Legittimo**
Mr Rocco **Cammarata**
Mr Andrea Giuseppe **Ercole**

Lettonie/Lettland/Latvia

Ms Marianna **Heislere**
Mr Dainis **Lacis**
Mr Valerijs **Stuppe**
Mr Vladimirs **Derevjanko**
Ms Lubova **Marigina**

Lituanie/Litauen/Lithuania

Ms Liubove Meile **Vanceviciene**
Ms Vita **Soboliene**

Luxembourg/Luxemburg/Luxembourg

Mr Albrecht **Wustrau**

Pays-Bas/Niederlande/Netherlands

Ms Sandra **Slikkerveer**
Mr Klaas **Tiemersma**
Mr Henk **Langenberg**

Pologne/Polen/Poland

Ms Joanna **Dolińska**
Mr Henryk **Ognik**
Mr Szczepan **Budzyński**

République tchèque/Tschechische Republik/Czech Republic

Mr Lubos **Knížek**
Ms Alena **Zátopková**
Mr Vladimír **Hájek**
Mr Jan **Hošek**
Mr Stanislav **Hájek**

Royaume-Uni/Vereinigtes Königreich/United Kingdom

Mr Ian **Boddington**
Mr Arne **Bale**
Mr Darren **Freezor**

Suède/Schweden/Sweden

Ms Katarina **Ström**

Suisse/Schweiz/Switzerland

Mr Colin **Bonnet**

Mr Hans **Vogt**

Turquie/Türkei/Turkey

Mr Cemalettin **Dogmus**

Mr Esat Emre **Koç**

Ukraine

Mr Vadim **Trepyton**

Ms Liudmyla **Trygub**

Ms Liudmyla **Bielova**

II. États non parties au RID/Nicht-RID-Vertragsstaaten/Non-RID Contracting States

Russie/Russland/Russia

Mr Arshavir **Kirakosyan**

Mr Vladimir **Maksimov**

Mr Alexandr **Khristolyubov**

**III. Organisations internationales gouvernementales/
Internationale Regierungsorganisationen/ International governmental organisations**

Union européenne/Europäische Union/European Union

Mr Roberto **Ferravante**

**Agence de l'Union européenne pour les chemins de fer / Eisenbahnagentur der
Europäischen Union / European Union Agency for Railways (ERA)**

Mr Emmanuel **Ruffin**

Committee of the Organization for Cooperation of Railways (OSJD)

Mr Reza **Lotfi**

**IV. Organisations internationales non gouvernementales
Internationale Nichtregierungsorganisationen
International non-governmental organisations**

CEFIC

Mr Torsten **Klein**
Mr Erwin **Sigrist**

UIC

Mr Jean-Georges **Heintz**
Mr Ralf **Redeker**

UIP

Mr Rainer **Kogelheide**
Mr Philippe **Laluc**

UIRR

Mr Onorato **Zanini**
Mr Ullrich **Lück**

V. Secrétariat/Sekretariat/Secretariat

Mr Jochen **Conrad**
Ms Katarina **Guricová**

VI. Interprètes/Dolmetscher/Interpreters

Mr Werner **Küpper**
Ms Joana **Meenken**
Mr David **Ashman**
Ms Irina **Peremota**
Ms Helena **Gizeleza**
