United Nations ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2011/35

# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
27 June 2011

Original: English

## Economic Commission for Europe

Inland Transport Committee

### Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

**Joint Meeting of the RID Committee of Experts and the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods**

Geneva, 13–23 September 2011
Item 7 of the provisional agenda
**Reports of informal working groups**

# Informal working group on telematics

## Proposal by the European Commission concerning telematic applications

## Identification of dangerous goods in telematic applications

## Transmitted by the European Union[1,2]

*Summary*

**Explanatory summary:** Definition for identification of the dangerous goods being carried in view of telematic applications for inland transport.

**Decision to be taken:** Decision.

**Related documents:** Informal document: INF.10 (OTIF) submitted at the spring 2011 session.

[1] In accordance with the programme of work of the Inland Transport Committee for 2010-2014 (ECE/TRANS/208, para 106, ECE/TRANS/2010/8, programme activity 02.7 (c)).

[2] Circulated by the Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail (OTIF) under the symbol OTIF/RID/RC/2011/35.

# Introduction

1. The March 2011 Joint Meeting was informed on the progress of the OTIF-UNECE informal working group on telematics (see informal document INF.10 submitted by OTIF at that session).

2. In particular the informal working group suggested that it would be sufficient for the *identification of dangerous good* being carried to specify the UN number, the packing group, and for certain substances the code related to Special Provision 640, from which all the other information in the Table A of RID/ADR/ADN Chapter 3.2 could then be derived.

3. After further examination, it appears that these three parameters are not sufficient to ensure an unambiguous identification of a single entry of the Table A in all cases. Using the seven parameters specified in the proposal of paragraph 6 would ensure this. For reasons of efficiency, the 'identification message' should, however, be as short and simple as possible. This would diminish communication costs and facilitate the implementation of the message in different telematic applications.

4. The order of transmission of the parameters contained in the ‘identification message’ should be common in all telematic applications to allow data exchange without subsequent processing of messages, and the parameters should be presented in such an order that the most important parameters are transmitted first. This would enhance safety if the message is interrupted during its transmission.

5. As the 'identification message' has a direct link with the European Railway Agency (ERA) technical documents supporting the implementation of the TAF TSI (*Commission Regulation (EC) No 62/2006 of 23 December 2005 concerning the technical specification for interoperability relating to the telematic applications for freight subsystem of the trans-European conventional rail system*) in rail transport, the European Commission proposes to adopt a common identification message for all inland transport of dangerous goods. Establishing such a message would present a starting point for harmonised and interoperable telematic applications between different modes of transport.

# Proposal

6. Add a new sub-section 3.1.4 to read as follows:

"3.1.4 Identification of dangerous goods in telematic applications

Where telematic applications are used, the identification of dangerous goods being carried shall contain at least the following information, in this order, for each dangerous good:

- UN number (Column 1 of Table A),
- Hazard identification number (Column 20 of Table A),
- Packing group (Column 4 of Table A),
- Classification code (Column 3b of Table A),
- Special provisions (Column 6 of Table A),
- Labels (Column 5 of Table A), and
- Class (Column 3a of Table A).

Any further information shall be presented after this information."

## Justification

7. Safety: Safety will be enhanced as the authorities and the operators will be able to identify unambiguously the entry of Table A for the dangerous good(s) being carried.

8. Feasibility: The decision concerns only the content of a message where telematics are applied voluntarily. However, the decision would facilitate the use of telematics and offer a harmonised starting point for applications in different transport modes.

9. Enforcement: Practical implementation in the European Union for rail carriage is being established in the ERA technical documents regarding the TAF TSI.