

OTIF



**ORGANISATION INTERGOUVERNEMENTALE POUR
LES TRANSPORTS INTERNATIONAUX FERROVIAIRES**

**ZWISCHENSTAATLICHE ORGANISATION FÜR DEN
INTERNATIONALEN EISENBAHNVERKEHR**

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

INF. 10

11 November 2011

(English and German only)

RID: 50th Session of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods
(Malmö, 21 – 25 November 2011)

Subject: Information from the Secretariat on the work of OSJD's ad hoc working group
on the revision of the provisions for the carriage of dangerous goods

Note by the Secretariat

Extract from informal document INF.24 of the RID/ADR/ADN Joint Meeting (Geneva, 13-23 September 2011)

(...)

3. In the period between 22 and 26 August 2011, an ad hoc OSJD working group met to deal with the differences that exist between RID and annex 2 to SMGS. The working group went through a table prepared by the representatives of Latvia and Poland in which these differences were set out individually.
4. At the first meeting of the working group, it was first necessary to establish which differences are justified and which differences could perhaps be eliminated on the basis of specific proposals.

Main differences

5. Differences are primarily to be found in Chapters 4.3 and 6.8, which are certainly justifiable for broad gauge tank-wagons. References to EN standards in Chapter 6.8 are also obstacles for various non-European States.

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.

6. However, it was also established that there are differences in the provisions concerning the construction of tank-containers according to RID/ADR on the one hand, and tank-containers according to annex 2 to SMGS on the other, which, if possible, should be eliminated owing to the multimodal nature of means of transport such as these. Among other things, it became clear that the provisions for RID/ADR tank-containers, which were originally developed for Western and Central Europe, are not completely suitable owing to the minimum temperatures that are possible in the geographical area covered by SMGS. For example, while RID/ADR assume a reference temperature range of -20°C to +50°C, annex 2 to SMGS assumes a temperature range of -40°C to +50°C.
7. In this context, the representative of OTIF pointed out that as a result of these differing construction provisions for tank-containers, multimodality in the legal area of SMGS was jeopardised, because in some SMGS Member States which are also Contracting Parties to ADR, the tank-container provisions of ADR are applied without modification.
8. Provisions in annex 2 to SMGS which only concern certain SMGS Member States may also be a further obstacle to traffic between Europe and Asia. In most cases, these derogations concern Kazakhstan, Russia, the Ukraine and Belarus.
9. According to RID 5.2.2.2.1.5, danger labels (and placards) may only contain other text indicating the nature of the risk and precautions to be taken in handling. But the information prescribed in annex 2 to SMGS concerning the emergency card to be used (three-figure number) may also, as an alternative, be indicated on the placards. This regularly causes problems in transport operations from the SMGS area into the RID area, because these numbers may not be indicated according to RID, and they can also be confused with the hazard identification number.

Future work

10. The Joint Meeting should encourage the OSJD ad hoc working group to continue on the path to achieve the widest possible harmonisation. Thanks are particularly due to the representatives of Latvia and Poland for their preparatory work and firm commitment to harmonising both sets of regulations.

Extract from the report of the RID/ADR/ADN Joint Meeting (Geneva, 13-23 September 2011) (ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/124 (OTIF/RID/RC/2011-B))

1. Multimodal harmonization

114. A member of the OTIF secretariat gave a progress report on the work to harmonize annex 2 of SMGS with RID (INF.24). He pointed out that the structure of annex 2 and most of its provisions were now compatible with RID and were regularly updated. However, major differences for transport in tank-wagons and tank-containers remained, and they still represented obstacles to Euro-Asian rail transport, at least in respect of transport according to Chapters 4.3 and 6.8, insofar as the reference temperatures were in the -40° C to +50° C range according to SMGS (as for UN portable tanks), while according to RID/ADR they were in the -20° C to +50° C range. There were also serious differences in labelling and placarding, as SMGS required that emergency card numbers be indicated on placards.
115. A member of the ECE secretariat pointed out that several States parties to SMGS were also Contracting Parties to ADR and ADN. Therefore, in addition to the problem of harmonization between SMGS and RID, there was also a need to harmonize SMGS with ADR and ADN. RID/ADR/ADN harmonization was considered essential for economic development in the Contracting Parties, and the same should apply to SMGS/ADR/ADN harmonization. To what extent could an SMGS container or tank-container be transported in multimodal or intermodal transport under ADR or ADN?

116. The Joint Meeting welcomed the efforts made by the Governments of Poland and especially Latvia to move ahead with SMGS/RID harmonization. It would be useful if the Joint Meeting had a document detailing the differences between SMGS on the one hand and RID/ADR on the other. The fact that the Joint Meeting working languages included Russian, German, English and French was a major advantage facilitating harmonization.
 117. The representative of Latvia said that he could submit such a document as soon as possible, but that it would be necessary to take into consideration that decisions were taken by consensus within OSJD.
 118. The Joint Meeting noted that, while the SMGS countries that were members of the European Union were well represented at its sessions, few of those that were not members of the European Union took part. It would be useful for such countries to be better represented for the discussion of such questions. The expertise available in the Working Group on Tanks would make it possible to discuss issues relating to differences in the treatment of tanks.
 119. The Joint Meeting also noted with interest a suggestion by IRU to consider whether in the long term it would be possible to have a single regime for transport in tank-wagons, based on the requirements for UN portable tanks, possibly amended. To do so, it would be necessary to consult with both the operators and the manufacturers of the tank-containers so as to determine the economic advantages or disadvantages in a context of globalization of trade.
-