

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/GTP/2012-A

18 December 2012

Original: German

TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE MEMBER STATES OF OTIF

**Final report of the 1st session of the RID Committee of Experts'
standing working group**

(Riga, 12 – 15 November 2012)

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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Para- graphs	Page
ITEM 1: Approval of the agenda	1	3
ITEM 2: Presence	2 - 3	3
ITEM 3: Election of the Chairmen	4	3
ITEM 4: Interpretation of RID	5 – 8	3
ITEM 5: Proposals for amendments to RID	9 – 38	4
A. Pending issues	9 – 22	4
B. New proposals	23 – 38	6
ITEM 6: Harmonisation of RID and Annex 2 to SMGS	39 – 92	8
ITEM 7: Information from the European Railway Agency (ERA)	93 – 95	15
ITEM 8: Any other business	96 – 107	15
Annex I: Texts adopted by the 1 st session of the RID Committee of Experts' standing working group		
Annex II: List of participants		

ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Document: A 81-03/504.2012 (Secretariat)

Informal document: INF.1 (Secretariat)

1. The meeting adopted the provisional agenda contained in invitation A 81-03/504.2012 dated 24 July 2012 with the list of documents published by the secretariat in informal document INF.1 and with the inclusion under agenda item 5 of Belgium's document OTIF/RID/CE/2012/8 pending from the last session.

ITEM 2: PRESENCE

2. The following RID Contracting States took part in the work of the 1st session of the working group (see also Annex II):

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

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

The European Commission, the European Railway Agency (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. Even though no quorum (**1/3 of 44 RID Contracting States entitled to vote**) was necessary for the meetings of the standing working group, the secretariat was very pleased that 21 Member States had accepted the invitation to take part in the working group's activities. With a view to the RID Committee of Experts' subsequent approval of the working group's decisions, it was important to establish that a broad majority of the RID Contracting States supported the working group's decisions.

ITEM 3: ELECTION OF THE CHAIRMEN

4. Mr Helmut Rein (Germany) was elected chairman of this standing working group until further notice. Mrs Caroline Bailleux (Belgium) was elected vice-chair.

ITEM 4: INTERPRETATION OF RID

Problems with checking the next inspection date and interpretation of "point of departure"

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2012/5 (Sweden)

5. According to 1.4.2.2.1 (d), the carrier must ascertain that the date of the next test for tanks has not expired. This is not a problem for tank-wagons and battery-wagons, because according to 6.8.2.5.2 and 6.8.3.5.11, the date of the next test must be shown on both sides of the tank-wagon or battery-wagon. But for tank-containers, **portable tanks** and MEGCs, this information is given on the tank plate and can only be seen if someone climbs onto the carrying wagon.

6. The working group supported Sweden's suggestion to submit a document to the Joint Meeting and the UN Sub-Committee of Experts to propose that the date of the next test should also be shown on both sides of tank-containers and portable tanks (on the tank itself or on plates). If there was no majority support for this proposal at these two bodies, a cross-reference to 1.4.2.2.1 (d) as well could be included in 1.4.2.2.2 concerning the reliability of the information and data made available by other participants. **However, this would presuppose that the carrier was provided with specific information on the date of the next test.**
7. According to the introductory sentence to 1.4.2.2.1, the carrier who takes over the dangerous goods at the point of departure has to carry out the checks.
8. In reply to Sweden's question as to what constitutes the point of departure of transport operations in a transport chain, the working group explained that this was the point at which carriage by rail began.

ITEM 5 PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENTS TO RID

A. Pending issues

Placarding of wagons

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2012/4 (Sweden)

Informal document: INF.11 (Sweden)

9. Following the discussions at the 50th session (OTIF/RID/CE/2011-A, paragraphs 39 to 43) and at the 51st session of the RID Committee of Experts (OTIF/RID/CE/2012-A, paragraphs 18 to 20), the representative of Sweden submitted a new document linking the possibility of using reduced size placards to the surface area available on the wagon.
10. Of the alternatives proposed in document 2012/4 and informal document INF.11, the working group decided in favour of proposal 1, which was adopted with a minor amendment to allow intermediate sizes as well (see Annex I).
11. Although some delegations did not consider a transitional provision necessary, the working group agreed to adopt the transitional provision proposed in paragraph 29 of document 2012/4, with the target date of 31 December 2017 (see Annex I). In particular, this should make it possible to modify wagons fitted with mounting frames for placards.

NHM Codes

Informal document: INF.2 (UIC)

12. The working group noted UIC's informal document INF.2. In the document, UIC pointed out the importance of the NHM Codes for the railways in organising their commercial services and explained that it was examining whether NHM Codes should be changed from six to eight digits. UIC would inform the secretariat of OTIF of any amendments or additions to the NHM Codes so that the relevant column in Table B of Chapter 3.2 can be kept up to date.

Fitting RID tank-wagons with a screw brake operable from the wagon gangway

Informal document: INF.3 (UIC)

13. In informal document INF.3, the representative of UIC submitted an interim report on the question of whether, for the carriage of dangerous goods, certain tank-wagons still have to be equipped with a hand brake that can be operated from the gangway.
14. Point 1.1.3 of UIC leaflet 573 (Technical conditions for the construction of tank wagons) referred to in 4.3.3.3.2, 6.8.2.2.1 and 6.8.4 says that tank-wagons in accordance with the requirements of leaflet 535-3 must be equipped with screw brakes. However, this requirement is not referred to in RID itself.
15. The working group agreed that it was sensible to equip tank-wagons for the carriage of dangerous goods with a **hand** brake, although the brake did not have to be operable from the gangway. In its view, the UIC leaflets could be amended in this respect. However, the representatives of UIC and UIP were both asked to check whether it might not be better to deal with various elements of UIC leaflet 573 in RID, including by means of references to standards. **The representative of UIC would submit his final report to the next session.**

Continued use of tank-wagons in accordance with the transitional provisions in 1.6.3.1, 1.6.3.2 and 1.6.3.3 of RID

Informal document: INF.10 (Germany)

16. The aim of this proposal submitted by Germany shortly before the meeting was to prohibit the open-ended continued use of gas tank-wagons built before 1 October 1978 (see also report of the 13th session of the working group on tank and vehicle technology, OTIF/RID/CE/GT/2012-A, paragraphs 27 to 31).
17. Various comments made at the meeting indicated that if older gas tank-wagons were withdrawn from service on a step-by-step basis, they could be subdivided more specifically. However, as tank-wagons before 1978 were built in accordance with national provisions, this would entail a lot of work, because it would have to be checked which material properties had to be guaranteed in the various States. On the other hand, the periodic test and inspection ensured that with the exception of the wall thickness, these tank-wagons met the current requirements.
18. While two States supported proposal 1 (prohibit the continued use of gas tank-wagons built before 1 January 1978 if they do not comply with the requirements concerning wall thickness and equipment, and withdrawal by 31 December 2021 of gas tank-wagons for the carriage of refrigerated liquefied gases built before 1 January 1978 if they do not meet the requirements concerning wall thickness), nine States preferred the step-by-step approach of proposal 2, according to which the approximately 5000 gas tank-wagons still in service under the current transitional periods would be successively withdrawn from service depending on their age.
19. Proposal 2 was adopted in square brackets with the deletion of "with the exception of tank-wagons intended for the carriage of gases of Class 2" in 1.6.3.3 and other editorial amendments. Several delegations thought the transitional provision in 1.6.3.3.1 of proposal 2 was too vague, because it said nothing about the age the oldest tank-wagons coming under the transitional provision may be. The working group agreed 1 January 1967 as the latest construction date (see Annex I).
20. It was agreed that for the time being, the texts should remain in square brackets so that the issue could be returned to at the next session on the basis of written proposals. Germany said it would submit a corresponding proposal for fixed tanks (tank-vehicles), demountable tanks and battery-vehicles to the Joint Meeting's working group on tanks.

Entity in Charge of Maintenance (ECM)

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/2012/8 (Belgium)

Informal document: INF.5 (ERA), paragraphs 3 to 5

21. Discussion of this document prepared by Belgium at the request of the 50th session of the RID Committee of Experts was deferred to the 1st session of the standing working group. A workshop organised by the European Commission and ERA on 24 October 2012 had come to the conclusion that it was necessary to clarify 1.4.3.5 and to align RID with the terminology of the provisions for ECM and the “approval of placing into service” (APS).
22. The representative of ERA was asked to draft a specific and comprehensive proposal for the next session of the standing working group. As a tank-wagon operator must be able to rely on the instructions provided by the entity in charge of maintenance, the proposal should also cover the obligations of the ECM.

B. New proposals

Protective distance between dangerous goods wagons and wagons with a load that could move longitudinally

Documents: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2012/1 (Belgium)

OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2012/2 (Belgium)

Informal document: INF.4 (UIC)

23. The majority of delegations did not support Belgium's proposal to prescribe a protective distance between tank-wagons carrying dangerous goods and wagons with a load that could move longitudinally and penetrate the tank-wagon in front. Only two States could envisage adopting the proposal.
24. The following reasons for rejecting the proposal were mentioned:
 - The main aim should be to eliminate the causes of accidents. But a complete final accident report clearly specifying the causes was not yet available.
 - Rules on a protective distance were being proposed for wagons which did not necessarily contain dangerous goods, so the question arose as to whether it would not be better to deal with this issue in the context of general railway safety.
 - In the past, there had been a negative reply to the question of whether extending the barrier wagon rule would improve safety, as additional shunting movements increase the risks (see also report A 81-03/504.2006 of the working group on tank and vehicle technology, paragraphs 26 to 29 and RID Committee of Experts' reports OTIF/RID/CE/2006-A, paragraphs 24 to 36 and OTIF/RID/CE/2007-A, paragraphs 51 to 54).
 - It was considered difficult completely to rule out dangerously shaped parts of loads, wagons and infrastructure which are capable at high speeds of penetrating a tank.
 - The question arose as to whether end walls can provide sufficient protection in accidents at high speeds.
25. As some issues of general railway safety were concerned, the working group assumed that further investigation should first be carried out by ERA.

Particulars on tank-wagons

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2012/3 (UIP)

26. While the Technical Specification for Interoperability relating to the subsystem "Traffic Operation and Management of the trans-European conventional rail system" (Commission decision 2006/920/EC of 11 August 2006) and the Uniform Technical Prescriptions relating to rolling stock, subsystem freight wagons (UTP WAG) of the APTU Uniform Rules (Appendix F to COTIF 1999) prescribe that the vehicle keeper be indicated on wagons, RID 6.8.2.5.2 and 6.8.3.5.11 require the name of the operator for tank-wagons. As according to footnote 4 to the definition of "operator of a tank-wagon" in 1.2.1, the term "operator" corresponds to the definition of "keeper" used in Appendix G to COTIF (ATMF) and in the Directives on railway safety and the interoperability of the Community's railway system, UIP's view was that this led to duplicate markings.
27. The working group adopted a specific proposal for amendment proposed verbally by the representative of UIP, according to which inscribing the "operator" on tank-wagons can be dispensed with (see Annex I).

Alignment of RID 5.4.1.2.1 (a) with ADR/ADN

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2012/6 (UIC)

28. The working group adopted UIC's proposal to align RID 5.4.1.2.1 (a) with ADR and ADN and to dispense with the information on the mass of each individual package for transport in wagon loads or full loads, with an editorial correction in the German version (see Annex I).

Marking for environmentally hazardous substances

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2012/7 (UIC)

Informal document: INF.5 (ERA), paragraphs 6 and 7

29. Only a few delegations supported UIC's proposal to create a number for the environmentally hazardous substance marking along the lines of the numbers for danger label models, in order to facilitate telematics applications. As column 5 of Table A did not contain any information on environmentally hazardous substances, various participants had come up with their own solutions.
30. The representative of UIC said he would discuss this issue with CEFIC, UIRR and other interested participants from the railway sector to come up with a solution, and would inform the working group of this at a later stage. The representative of ERA pointed out that the European Commission had mandated ERA to check the information required by the technical documents of the TAF TSI (Telematic applications for freight transport) to ensure that there were no contradictions with the requirements of RID.

Expert performing tests and inspections on tanks of tank-wagons

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2012/10 (Italy)

31. In his document, the representative of Italy requested that OTIF's website should indicate not just the stamp of the inspection bodies that carry out tests on the tanks of tank-wagons, but also the identification codes of each inspection body's individual experts.

32. The chairman reminded the meeting that 6.8.2.4.6 had been included in RID in order that tanks could be tested in all the Member States. According to Directive 1999/36, when gas tanks were tested, it was notified bodies that were acting, rather than individual experts. However, according to the third from last sub-paragraph of 6.8.2.4.6, the staff of these notified bodies were also considered qualified to carry out tests on tanks for substances of classes 3 to 9 as well.
33. It was noted that 6.8.2.4.6 did not yet include any links to the new 1.8.6 and 1.8.7 (inspection bodies and procedures for conformity assessment and periodic inspections). As the signatures of individual experts had to be deposited for inspection bodies and notified bodies, on the basis of which it was possible to ascertain which expert had carried out the tests, one solution might be to include, after the first sentence of the penultimate sub-paragraph in 6.8.2.4.6, the possibility of the RID Contracting States' being able to recognise inspection bodies and notified bodies and to notify them to the secretariat. For experts who work for an inspection body or notified body, the stamp or marking stamp of the inspection body or notified body would probably suffice.
34. The representatives of Germany, Italy and UIP said they were prepared to submit a revised proposal to the next meeting of the working group.

Languages to be used in the transport document

Informal document: INF.9 (Belgium)

35. Belgium proposed that for the additional information to be included in the transport document according to 5.5.2.4.1 and 5.5.3.7.1, only the languages generally used for the transport document in accordance with 5.4.1.4.1 should be permitted, i.e. German, English or French.
36. The chairman pointed out that in various places in RID and in general railway legislation, it was permitted to use Italian. Furthermore, the document referred to in 5.5.2.4.1 and 5.5.3.7.1 need not necessarily be a transport document.
37. With regard to the language rules, the representative of the Netherlands suggested carrying out an overall assessment of the RID provisions concerning marking and the information in the transport document and its annexes.
38. Following this discussion, the representative of Belgium withdrew her document.

ITEM 6: HARMONISATION OF RID AND ANNEX 2 TO SMGS

Marking wagons with the emergency card number in accordance with SMGS Annex 2

Informal documents: INF.7 (Slovakia and Czech Republic)
INF.12 (Latvia)

39. In their informal document INF.7, Slovakia and the Czech Republic proposed that for traffic from SMGS Contracting States to RID Contracting States, it should be permitted to indicate in the bottom half of the placard the emergency card number prescribed in SMGS Annex 2.
40. In his document INF.12, the representative of Latvia drew attention to a change in the legislation in the 2013 edition of SMGS Annex 2. According to this, the emergency card number could only be shown in the bottom half of placards for wagons, tank-wagons and battery-wagons, not for large containers, portable tanks, tank-containers or MEGCs used in multi-modal transport. In addition, for transport in wagons, tank-wagons or battery-wagons in or through the territory of Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Estonia, the Note to 5.3.7.1 (a) of SMGS Annex 2 also excluded the possibility of indicating this information on the placard.

41. At the suggestion of the representative of Russia, OSJD was asked to amend the Note to 5.3.7.1 (a) of SMGS Annex 2 in such a way that for transport in or through the territory of States that apply RID, the emergency card number must be shown on a separate white plate. It should also be checked whether the footnote after the heading in 5.3.7 could be dropped. This footnote says that the provisions of 5.3.7 must not be applied in Poland, Slovakia and Hungary.

Information in the transport document in Russian in accordance with SMGS Annex 2

Informal document: INF.8 (Slovakia and Czech Republic)

42. In informal document 8, Slovakia and the Czech Republic proposed that for transport from RID Contracting States to SMGS Contracting States, the information in the CIM/SMGS consignment note should also be prescribed in Russian. The issue of the use of Russian was already dealt with in CIT's GLV-CIM/SMGS Manual, which contained instructions on how to use the CIM/SMGS consignment note.
43. The chairman pointed out that RID already dealt with the interfaces with other modes. For example, RID 5.4.2 dealt with issuing a container/vehicle packing certificate, which was only necessary for subsequent carriage by sea. Similarly, 5.4.1.4.1 could contain a statement on the transition to another legal area.
44. As a different rule concerning the languages to be used would also have to be included in SMGS Annex 2 for transport in the opposite direction, it was agreed that this issue should first be dealt with by the OSJD working group responsible for SMGS Annex 2 and the standing working group would then return to this matter at the next meeting on the basis of a new document.

Fundamental differences between the 2011 editions of SMGS Annex 2 and RID

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2012/9 (OSJD)

General

45. Firstly, the chairman thanked OSJD for the work it had done in the past on transposing the new structure of RID into SMGS Annex 2. He then explained the working methods of the RID Committee of Experts, which could not amend the global and multimodal guidelines of the UN Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods or the common provisions developed by the Joint RID/ADR/ADN meeting for all the European land modes. In addition, some provisions had originated from harmonisation with EU law, as the EU Member States could no longer implement their own dangerous goods provisions for national transport. As a result, the RID Committee of Experts could only discuss issues in connection with the carriage of dangerous goods by rail in Europe. In connection with the harmonisation of SMGS Annex 2 and RID, the RID Committee of Experts' working group could only submit proposals on which sections of SMGS Annex 2 should be amended, or it could amend RID itself.
46. The representative of OSJD explained that his organisation was prepared to examine all the working group's proposals to eliminate differences in order to facilitate Euro-Asian traffic.
47. The representative of the European Commission pointed out that Directive 2008/68 contained separate provisions for EU Member States which apply both RID and SMGS Annex 2 (see Annex II, II.2, paragraphs 2 and 8 of the Directive). It was also in the European Commission's interest that the differences between the two legal regimes be minimised.

48. The representative of Latvia explained that this synopsis reflected differences in the 2011 edition. With regard to the 2013 amendments, it was not anticipated that there would be any additional differences.

Sub-sections 1.1.2.2, 1.1.2.3, 1.1.3.1 (a) and 1.1.3.8

49. The representative of Latvia explained that the problem of the carriage of dangerous goods in passenger trains would shortly be resolved, as approval for this was to be included in SMPS.

Sub-sections 1.1.3.1 (c) and 1.1.3.6

50. The chairman explained that 1.1.3.1 (c) dealt with the exemption of small quantities of dangerous goods in national transport and that this might also be useful for SMGS Annex 2.

Section 1.3.1

51. As the differences that existed were due to differences in the underlying legal system, this was not looked at in more detail.

Sub-section 1.4.1.3, sub-sections 1.4.2.1.1 and 1.4.2.1.2

52. In RID, in addition to the main participants (consignor, carrier, consignee), various secondary participants were also assigned clear obligations. In order to avoid overly intrusive incursions into national legislation, the Member States were able to assign obligations differently. However, in order to maintain transparency, these differently assigned obligations had to be notified to the secretariat so that other States could be made aware of them.

53. The representative of Russia explained that structural reforms in the corresponding Russian provisions might mean that other secondary participants would be introduced in addition to the three main participants.

Sub-section 1.5.1.1

54. RID multilateral special agreements, by means of which for example amendments to the legislation that have already been adopted can be implemented earlier, may only be concluded between the Member States' national authorities, not between the various economic operators involved, as is the case in SMGS Annex 2.

55. In reply to the chairman's question of whether the temporary derogations concluded between the various economic operators in accordance with SMGS Annex 2 were also valid for EU Member States, the representative of the European Commission explained that Annex II, II.2, paragraphs 2 and 8 of Directive 2008/68/EC made this possible, provided an equivalent level of safety was guaranteed.

Transitional provisions in Chapter 1.6

56. The representative of Latvia explained that the general transitional provision in 1.6.1.1 of **SMGS Annex 2** allowed the old provisions to be applied up to 31 December of the year in which the new provisions entered into force. This was linked to the fact that unlike RID, the new provisions of SMGS Annex 2 entered into force on 1 July of each odd-numbered year. He announced that the 2013 edition of SMGS Annex 2 would include provisions to enable the use of RID tank-containers covered by older transitional provisions, which had not been permitted previously.

57. The working group asked the OSJD Committee to examine whether, following the example of the IMDG Code, optional application of the new provisions of SMGS Annex 2 could be permitted as early as 1 January of each odd-numbered year. In view of the fact that in the RID area, big companies changed over to the new provisions as early as 1 January, this was of great importance.

Chapters 1.8 and 1.9

58. As neither of these two chapters were relevant to the interfaces, the differences were not examined in more depth.

Chapter 1.10

59. The working group suggested that it might be worth checking whether it would also be useful and necessary for the OSJD Member States to apply Chapter 1.10, which was equivalent to Chapter 1.4 of the UN Model Regulations.

Chapter 3.2, Table A, column 19

60. UIC was asked to check whether carriage as express parcels still took place in practice in the area of the RID Member States (see report OTIF/RID/CE/2010-A of the 47th session of the RID Committee of Experts (Berne, 19 and 20 May 2010), paragraph 31 (f)). If this were not the case, column 19 of Table A and Chapter 7.6 of RID could be deleted.

Chapter 3.2, Table A, columns 21a, 21b and 21c

61. Columns 21a, 21b and 21c of Table A of SMGS Annex 2 contained coded provisions concerning the emergency card number, the minimum protective distance and the conditions for **hump** shunting. In contrast, RID contained instructions in writing in accordance with 5.4.3, although these were only for train drivers and not for the emergency services, provisions concerning the protective distance in 7.5.3, which only applied to substances of Class 1, and in Chapter 3.2, Table A, column 5, information on whether a shunting label corresponding to model 13 or 15 is prescribed.
62. The meeting noted that these three columns could not be harmonised, but that at least the RID Contracting States Hungary, Poland and Slovakia were exempt from applying the provisions.

Chapter 3.3, special provision 274

63. It was recalled that the allocation of special provision 274 had been harmonised in the UN Model Regulations, the IMDG Code and RID/ADR/ADN, and that this special provision had subsequently been deleted from UN numbers 2985, 2986 and 2988 in RID.
64. As special provision CW 65 in section 7.5.11 of SMGS Annex 2 had to be observed for UN numbers 2985 and 2988, depending on the technical name, it was agreed to defer this issue for the time being. If investigations revealed that different emergency measures were necessary for the various technical names of these UN numbers, an appropriate proposal should be submitted to the Joint Meeting.

Chapter 3.3, special provision 800

65. The additional special provision 800 in SMGS Annex 2, which was assigned to UN numbers 1381 and 2447 (phosphorus), specified that the transport document had to contain information on the protective medium used. This was because of a serious accident that had occurred in the Ukraine about five years ago.

66. As these transport operations were primarily **regular east/west and west/east** railway transport operations, which also concerned RID Contracting States, and as it might therefore be worthwhile having a rule in RID as well, it was agreed that Latvia would first discuss this matter with other SMGS Member States and would then submit a proposal to the working group.

Chapter 3.4

67. The chairman recalled that in the past, the provisions concerning limited quantities had evolved differently for the various modes and that after a lot of preparatory work, harmonisation of the modal provisions had finally been achieved in 2011. Thus the same provisions would be valid for ADR, to which Russia was a Contracting Party. Against this background, and owing to the fact that in the past, the limited quantity provisions had repeatedly caused problems, he called for the tightening of the provisions applicable to the CIS States to be re-examined.

Packing instructions P 002 and IBC 07.

68. IBCs were not allowed for the carriage of UN 1680, potassium cyanide, solid, and UN 1689 sodium cyanide, solid, in or through the territory of Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation, the Ukraine and Belarus, and single packagings had to have an additional leakproof liner.
69. The representative of the Ukraine explained that this additional requirement had been included on the basis of national standards, but agreed that this would have to be discussed again to achieve harmonisation with the provisions of other modes.

Packing instruction P 801a

70. The representative of Russia explained that prohibiting the carriage of used batteries (storage batteries) of UN numbers 2794, 2795, 2800 and 3028 in sheeted wagons and sheeted containers in or through the territory of Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation, Uzbekistan or Belarus should be considered in connection with the prohibitions in Chapter 7.2 of SMGS Annex 2, and these were for reasons of theft prevention rather than safety. On the other hand, the 2013 edition would allow carriage in sheeted wagons and sheeted containers on the basis of agreements.

Special portable tank provision TP 60

71. Special provision TP 60, which is only in SMGS Annex 2, says that the carriage of refrigerant **gases** of UN numbers 1009, 2035, 3220 and 3252 in or through the territory of Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation, the Ukraine or Belarus **in portable tanks** is prohibited.
72. The representative of Russia explained that special provision TP 60 should be **revised** for the 2015 edition and deleted, if necessary. As the provisions for portable tanks, which are designed for the strictest requirements worldwide, were harmonised across the modes, there was no reason to maintain special provision TP 60 **in the future**.

Paragraph 4.3.2.1.6

73. In RID, the alternate use of tanks for the carriage of foodstuffs and dangerous goods is allowed in principle. Paragraph 4.3.2.1.6 of SMGS Annex 2 contained a footnote prohibiting the carriage of foodstuffs from or to Kazakhstan or the Russian Federation in tanks also used for the carriage of dangerous goods. However, there were some foodstuffs that were also dangerous goods at the same time (e.g. alcohol, vinegar, phosphoric acid used in the production of cola, or feedstuffs which are environmentally hazardous).

74. The representative of the Russian Federation agreed that the text of the footnote in SMGS Annex 2 would have to be reworded. A distinction should be made between tanks used for the carriage of all types of dangerous goods and tanks used only for the carriage of foodstuffs that are also dangerous goods.
75. On the other hand, an amendment to the text of RID/ADR could be considered, because for the carriage of such foodstuffs in accordance with EU law, only foodstuff tanks may be used.

Paragraph 4.3.2.2.4

76. While RID only provides for the tanks of tank-containers for the carriage of liquids to be fitted with dividing walls or surge plates, or to be filled to a minimum of 80% or a maximum of 20% of the capacity, SMGS Annex 2 contains this requirements for tank-wagons also. According to the representatives of Poland and the Russian Federation, these requirements arose partly from derailments in Siberia in which, for weight reasons (and for example due to the cooling of the heating oil during transport), the tanks were not completely filled, and partly from the different construction requirements for 1520 mm gauge tank-wagons, whose centre of gravity differed from that of normal gauge tank-wagons because of the larger radius of the tank.
77. The representative of UIC reminded the meeting that an investigative report from the 1960s had led to surge plates being removed from tank-wagons. The background to this had been problems with the surge plate mountings, stress cracking and adverse effects on the flexibility of the shells.
78. The working group decided to examine this issue in more depth in the working group on tank and vehicle technology on the basis of the UIC report prepared at that time and with the participation of interested SMGS Contracting States.

Paragraph 4.3.2.3.3

79. The representative of Latvia pointed out that the additional sentence in RID had been taken into account in the 2013 edition of SMGS Annex 2, so there was no longer any difference.

Paragraph 4.3.2.3.6

80. This paragraph, which deals with the carriage of dangerous goods which may react dangerously with each other in multi-compartment tanks, was worded differently in the two sets of regulations, but achieved the same aim. However, a Note in SMGS Annex 2 did not allow filled compartments to be separated by empty compartments in the Russian Federation.
81. As carriage in multi-compartment tanks was very rare in rail transport, this issue was not very important, so the difference, which the representative of the Russian Federation said was supposed to help avoid accidents, could be maintained.

Paragraph 4.3.2.3.7

82. According to SMGS Annex 2, large tank-containers designed for a longitudinal inertial force of $2 Rg$ (where R is the maximum net mass of the tank-container and g is acceleration due to gravity) may only be carried on 1520 mm gauge railway lines on the basis of special agreements. In contrast, there were no restrictions for portable tanks, as a prototype of each design has to satisfy the requirements of the dynamic longitudinal impact test prescribed in the Manual of Tests and Criteria.
83. This matter should be discussed again in connection with the construction requirements of Chapter 6.8.

Paragraph 4.3.2.3.8

84. Owing to the low temperatures prevalent in Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation in the winter months, SMGS Annex 2 requires that tank-containers carried in these States between 1 November and 1 April be designed for a minimum temperature of -50°C.
85. In the working group's view, this fundamental difference could not be resolved.

Paragraphs 4.3.3.4.1 and 4.3.3.4.3

86. The texts of these two paragraphs in SMGS Annex 2 make clear that the control measures before and after the filling of liquefied gas tank-wagons have to be carried out by the consignor. In a Note, it is pointed out that for those States that are also RID Contracting States, the obligations are assigned differently.
87. In RID, the obligations are assigned in Chapter 1.4. As RID, unlike SMGS Annex 2, covers several participants, it was not possible to harmonise this part at the moment (see also paragraphs 52 and 53).

Sub-section 4.3.3.5

88. According to paragraphs 6.8.5.1.3 and 6.8.5.1.4 of both sets of regulations, shells and the securing of fittings and accessories to the shell may be hard-soldered. 4.3.3.5 of SMGS Annex 2 restricts this construction requirement for tank-wagons and tank-containers insofar as a special agreement is required on 1520 mm gauge sections.
89. The representative of UIC explained that this provision was linked to the automatic coupling of wagons, in which harder impacts could occur. As far as the representative of Russia was aware, no such wagons with hard-soldered shells existed at present, so this provision was irrelevant at the moment.

Paragraph 4.3.4.1.2

90. An additional Note on this paragraph in SMGS Annex 2 says that "**Part 1 of the tank hierarchy¹ shall not be used for the railways of Kazakhstan, Russian Federation and Ukraine**". The representatives of Latvia and Russia explained that in practice, there was no need to carry solids in tanks for liquids, as technical problems would arise, particularly when filling or discharging.
91. The secretariat recalled that the possibility of using tanks for liquids for the carriage of solids had been incorporated on the basis of a proposal from France for the RID/ADR/ADN Joint Meeting (document OTIF/RID/RC/2004/20 – ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2004/20). This was to enable the carriage of solids and their aqueous solutions (e.g. UN 1495 sodium chlorate and UN 2428 sodium chlorate, aqueous solution) in the same tank, as had already been possible before RID/ADR had been restructured.

Next steps

92. The working group agreed that the work should first be continued in a small joint working group comprising those OTIF and OSJD Member States that were interested, and that a condensed document showing the differences between the two sets of dangerous goods regulations should be submitted to the 2nd session of the RID Committee of Experts' standing working group (Copenhagen, 18 – 22 November 2013). The secretariat would write officially to the OSJD Committee about this and fix a date together with the OSJD Committee. The

¹ If an S tank code is assigned in column 12 of Table A, tanks with an L tank code may also be used.

secretariat was also asked to summarise the positive results achieved so far and send them to the OSJD secretariat.

ITEM 7: INFORMATION FROM THE EUROPEAN RAILWAY AGENCY (ERA)

Informal document: INF.5 (ERA)

93. The working group noted informal document INF.5 submitted by ERA.
94. The chairman was of the view that in paragraph 12, the words "and do not take precedence over them" should be deleted, as Directive 2008/68/EC took precedence in those cases in which it was a matter of the carriage of dangerous goods.
95. In connection with the notification of national provisions of relevance to the EU railway system, several delegations urged that the dangerous goods regulatory committee be involved and that cooperation between the dangerous goods regulatory committee and the RISC committee be improved.

ITEM 8: ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Rail accident at Kijfhoek marshalling yard (near Zwijndrecht) on 14 January 2011

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2012/8 (Netherlands)

96. The representative of the Netherlands reported on a railway accident that had occurred at a marshalling yard on 14 January 2011 in which a tank-wagon containing ethanol had been gutted by fire. Two groups of wagons, each comprised of four wagons, had rolled onto their marshalling track too fast and had collided with the wagons that were already on this track.
97. Firstly, the accident investigation had revealed that the information at marshalling yards with respect to the precise position of wagons containing dangerous goods was insufficient, and secondly, that crash-buffers would have limited the extent of the damage. He would welcome an exchange of experiences with other States concerning the provision of information in marshalling yards and a discussion on whether special provision TE 22 (equipping with crash-buffers) should be extended to include less dangerous substances.
98. In the subsequent discussion, various participants raised the following particular points:
 - Modern marshalling yards are equipped in such a way that shunting speeds cannot exceed 6 km/h. If the retarders do not work, hump shunting should not be carried out **or alternative operating procedures should be used to ensure that shunting can be carried out safely**. The question therefore arose as to why the wagons had rolled too quickly.
 - Chapter 1.11 prescribed internal emergency plans for marshalling yards. If UIC leaflet 201 referred to in that Chapter were applied, it should be guaranteed that the emergency services are informed immediately.
 - In Belgium, the infrastructure manager requires that the precise position of wagons can be established with the help of a database.
 - It might be possible to enable precise positioning by means of telematics applications.

- In connection with the fact that the ethanol tank was punctured by a buckled central solebar, it was pointed out that there had already been some discussion in the working group on tank and vehicle technology in 2004 on wagons with central solebars, external solebars and self-supporting tanks (see the report of the working group on tank and vehicle technology, A 81-03/507.2004, paragraphs 37 to 41 and the report of the RID Committee of Experts, A 81-03/511.2004, paragraphs 36 to 38).

99. The representative of the Netherlands was asked to submit a proposal, if necessary, on the basis of the accident investigation, specifying the groups of products to which special provision TE 22 should also apply. In so doing, the Netherlands could draw on any available accident reports and findings so far in terms of retrofitting wagons with crash-buffers.
100. To avoid unnecessary work, the representatives of the European Commission and ERA were asked to provide information on whether there were any obstacles to extending special provision TE 22.

Carriage of coal in bulk

Informal document: INF.6 (UIC)

101. The chairman introduced UIC's informal document INF.6, which contained reports of incidents in which coal had self-ignited during carriage in inland waterway vessels and wagons. Tests on samples using test procedure N.4 in accordance with the United Nations Manual of Tests and Criteria had shown that the classification criteria of Class 4.2, packing group III were met. For carriage as dangerous goods of UN number 1361, packing group III, sheeted wagons or movable roof wagons would have to be used instead of the open wagons used at present.
102. It was agreed that an amendment to the provisions of RID would be discussed at the next session of the working group on the basis of a specific proposal. **The general idea could be a far reaching exemption for coal under certain conditions. For carriage by inland waterways, for example, conditions of the loading temperature and limiting the duration of the transport operation were considered to be relevant.** Until then, the current practice of using open wagons should be legalised by concluding a multilateral special agreement.

Flexible bulk containers

Document: INF.2 from the 52nd session of the RID Committee of Experts (Secretariat), paragraphs 32 to 34.

103. The Joint Meeting (Geneva, 17 to 21 September 2012) had decided to set up an informal working group, in particular to draft conditions for the carriage of flexible bulk containers in wagons, road vehicles and inland waterway vessels.
104. This working group will be held in Saint Petersburg in the last week of May 2013.

Thanks

105. The chairman thanked the Latvian delegation for their hospitality and the excellent organisation of this meeting. Latvia had made a positive contribution to promoting understanding between the delegations of OTIF and OSJD. He thanked the interpreters and the secretariat for their excellent work.
106. On behalf of all the delegations, the deputy chair thanked the chairman for his usual effortless conduct of the discussions.

Next session

107. At the invitation of Denmark, the 2nd session of the RID Committee of Experts' standing working group will be held in Copenhagen from 18 to 22 November 2013. Part of the meeting will again be held jointly with the experts on Annex 2 to SMGS in order to deal with the question of the harmonisation of RID and SMGS Annex 2 (see also paragraph 92). For this reason, Russian interpretation should again be provided.
-

Texts adopted by the 1st session of the RID Committee of Experts' standing working group**PART 1**

1.6.1 Add the following new transitional provision:

"**1.6.1.28** Existing placards which meet the requirements of 5.3.1.7.4 applicable up to 31 December 2014 may continue to be used until 31 December 2017."

[Reference document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2012/4]

**[1.6.3.1 –
1.6.3.3**

Amend to read as follows:

"**1.6.3.1** (Deleted)

1.6.3.2 (Deleted)

1.6.3.3 Tank-wagons whose shells were built before the entry into force of the requirements applicable as from 1 October 1978 may still be used if their wall thickness and items of equipment meet the requirements of Chapter 6.8.

1.6.3.3.1 Tank-wagons which are intended for the carriage of gases of Class 2 and whose shells were built between 1 January 1967 and 31 December 1970 may still be used until 31 December 2021 if their items of equipment but not their wall thickness meet the requirements of Chapter 6.8.

1.6.3.3.2 Tank-wagons which are intended for the carriage of gases of Class 2 and whose shells were built between 1 January 1971 and 31 December 1975 may still be used until 31 December 2025 if their items of equipment but not their wall thickness meet the requirements of Chapter 6.8.

1.6.3.3.3 Tank-wagons which are intended for the carriage of gases of Class 2 and whose shells were built between 1 January 1976 and 30 September 1978 may still be used until 31 December 2029 if their items of equipment but not their wall thickness meet the requirements of Chapter 6.8."]

[Reference document: INF.10]

PART 5

5.3.1.7.4 Amend to read as follows:

"**5.3.1.7.4** If the size and construction of the wagon **are** such that the available surface area is insufficient to affix the prescribed placards, their dimensions may be reduced to **a minimum of** 150 mm by 150 mm. In this case, the other dimensions prescribed for the symbol, lines, figures and letters do not apply."

[Reference document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2012/4, proposal 1]

5.4.1.2.1 Amend paragraph (a) to read as follows:

"(a) The transport document shall indicate, in addition to the requirements in 5.4.1.1.1 (f):

- the total net mass, in kg, of explosive contents⁶⁾ for each substance or article bearing a different UN number;
- the total net mass, in kg, of explosive contents⁶⁾ for all substances and articles covered by the transport document.

⁶⁾ For articles, "explosive contents" means the explosive substance contained in the article."

[Reference document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2012/6]

PART 6**6.8.2.5.2** Amend the first indent in the left-hand column to read as follows:

"– vehicle keeper marking or name of operator^{*)};"

^{*)} Vehicle keeper marking in accordance with Annex PP, section PP.1 of the Uniform Technical Prescriptions applicable to rolling stock, subsystem freight wagons (UTP WAG) of the APTU Uniform Rules (Appendix F to COTIF 1999) (see www.otif.org) and in accordance with paragraph 4.2.2.3 and Annex P of Commission decision [2011/314/EU of 12 May 2011](#) concerning the technical specification of interoperability relating to the "operation and traffic management" subsystem of the trans-European conventional rail system."

[Reference document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2012/3]

6.8.3.5.11 Amend the first indent in the left-hand column to read as follows:

"– vehicle keeper marking or name of operator^{*)};"

^{*)} Vehicle keeper marking in accordance with Annex PP, section PP.1 of the Uniform Technical Prescriptions applicable to rolling stock, subsystem freight wagons (UTP WAG) of the APTU Uniform Rules (Appendix F to COTIF 1999) (see www.otif.org) and in accordance with paragraph 4.2.2.3 and Annex P of Commission decision [2011/314/EU of 12 May 2011](#) concerning the technical specification of interoperability relating to the "operation and traffic management" subsystem of the trans-European conventional rail system."

[Reference document: OTIF/RID/CE/GTP/2012/3]

List of participants

I. Governments

Austria

Mr. O. Krammer (Min.)

Belgium

Ms. C. Bailleux (Min.)

Bulgaria

Ms. M. Stefanova (Min.)

Croatia

Mr. B. Mikulić (Min.)

Czech Republic

Mr. L. Knížek (Min.)

Mr. V. Kyncl (Min.)

Mr. V. Hájek (Technoinspect)

Denmark

Ms. I. Akbar (Min.)

Ms. B. Daugaard (Min.)

Estonia

Ms. J. Agamalova (Min.)

Finland

Ms. A. Häkkinen (Min.)

France

Ms. G. Pompidor (Min.)

Germany

Mr. H. Rein (Min.)

Mr. A. Hoffmann (Min.)

Mr. B. Hilbert (EBA)

Italy

Mr. B. Legittimo (Min.)

Latvia

Ms. M. **Heislere** (Min.)
 Mr. V. **Stuppe** (Min.)
 Mr. D. **Lacis** (Min.)
 Mr. M. **Andžāns** (Min.)
 Mr. E. **Heislere** (Min.)
 Mr. J. **Pakalns** (Min.)
 Mr. V. **Derevjanko** (LDZ Cargo)
 Ms. L. **Marigina** (LDZ Cargo)

Lithuania

Mr. A. **Tolstoj** (Min.)

Luxembourg

Mr. K. **Behlke** (Min.)

Netherlands

Mr. K. R. **Tiemersma** (Min.)

Poland

Ms. J. **Dolńska** (Min.)
 Mr. K. **Irmiński** (PKP Cargo)

Russia²

Mr. A. **Khristolyubov** (Min.)
 Ms. N. **Pechnikova** (Min.)
 Ms. E. **Goryacheva** (RZD)
 Ms. T. **Kornikova** (RZD)
 Mr. V. **Androsyuk** (RZD)
 Mr. A. **Skuratov** (JSC "SG-Trans")

Slovakia

Mr. M. **Sedlák** (Min.)

Sweden

Mr. B. **Zetterström** (Min.)
 Mr. H. **Nordqvist** (Min.)
 Mr. B. **Antonsson** (Min.)

Switzerland

Mr. C. **Bonnet** (Min.)

² Member State of OTIF which does not apply RID and hence according to Article 16 § 1 of COTIF is unable to vote.

Ukraine

Ms. L. Trygub (Min.)

United Kingdom

Mr. A. Bale (Scientifics)

European Union

Mr. T. Aaltonen

European Railway Agency

Mr. E. Ruffin

II. International governmental organisations

OSJD

Mr. E. Arfa

III. International non-governmental organisations

CEFIC

Mr. T. Klein

UIC

Mr. J-G. Heintz

UIP

Mr. R. Kogelheide

Mr. P. Laluc

UIRR

Mr. U. Lück

IV. Secretariat

Mr. J. Conrad

Ms. K. Guricová

Mr. W. Küpper (interpreter)

Mr. D. Ashman (interpreter)
