



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
19 May 2014
English
Original: French

Economic Commission for Europe

Inland Transport Committee

Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

Joint Meeting of Experts on the Regulations annexed to the European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Inland Waterways (ADN) (ADN Safety Committee)

Twenty-fifth session

Geneva, 25–29 August 2014

Item 4 (b) of the provisional agenda

**Proposals for amendments to the Regulations annexed to ADN:
Other proposals**

8.6.3 ADN Checklist

Transmitted by the Government of Germany^{1,2}

I. Introduction

1. For ADN 2015, several amendments have been adopted concerning the availability of means of evacuation. The new definition is worded as:

“Means of evacuation: any means that can be used by people to move from danger to safety as follows: (...)”.

2. One of the other amendments is worded as follows:

8.6.3, ADN Checklist, question (4). Replace by the following text: “Have suitable means in accordance with 7.1.4.77 and 7.2.4.77 been provided for boarding or leaving, including in cases of emergency?”

¹ In accordance with the programme of work of the Inland Transport Committee for 2012-2016 (ECE/TRANS/224, para 94, ECE/TRANS/2012/12, programme activity 02.7, (A1b)).

² Distributed in German by the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine under the symbol CCNR/ZKR/ADN/WP.15/AC.2/2014/34.



3. In the view of the German delegation, the new wording of question (4) does not correspond with the definition of means of evacuation, as it also addresses the question of **boarding** the vessel.

II. Proposal

4. It is proposed to change the amendment to question (4), as follows:

“8.6.3, ADN Checklist, amend question (4) to read as follows:

“Have suitable means in accordance with 7.1.4.77 and 7.2.4.77 been provided for ~~boarding~~
~~or~~ leaving, including in cases of emergency?”

III. Justification

5. The addition of the words “boarding or” can give rise to wrong interpretations when determining whether the means of evacuation available at the handling point are appropriate. For example, for the escape routes, such a requirement, which does not appear in the definition, could have inappropriate consequences for the location or configuration of the means of evacuation.

6. The legal ambiguity should be avoided.

IV. Implementation

7. The amendment is purely editorial and requires no logistic measures or investment.

V. Safety

8. The modification will have no effect on the safety of transport. The role of the means of evacuation is established in the definition and will remain unchanged.
