France recently submitted an amendment for ADR/ADN/RID. However, the participants to the latest ADR/ADN/RID joint meeting weren’t ready to adopt this amendment without this subject being previously discussed in the context of TRANSSC. I’d like to see with you how we could now move forward.

First let me please summarise the previous episodes. Consistently with SSR6 §572 and since 2015, ADR/ADN § 5.3.2.1.4 and RID § 5.3.2.1.1 require the UN number to be displayed on the orange-coloured plate only when the radioactive material is required to be carried under exclusive use (which isn’t the case in most of the situations). We see this restriction as problematic because the UN number may be the only way for the emergency services to determine which radioactive materials are involved in an accident.

Example: an accident involves an enriched UF6 shipment. The emergency services are unable to get useful information from the driver or reach the consignor or the shipper. If the emergency services see the UN number, the can take appropriate measures such as extending the security perimeter, using special protection suits and respiratory systems, cooling the non-damaged packages with water or refraining from using water on damaged packages. If not, they won’t be able to take into account the specific issues related to enriched UF6.

Therefore, we suggested to require the UN number be displayed except when it isn’t meaningful or convenient (for example, if radioactive materials corresponding to several UN numbers are simultaneously carried). Please see the two attached documents for the detailed proposal and its justification.

We discussed this with the other EACA members and, after having taking into account their suggestions, they either approved of or didn’t object to it. We then presented our proposal at the ADR/ADN/RID meeting. Some delegations were uncomfortable about accepting a change which didn’t derive from SSR6. The conclusion was that the approval was dependent on this issue being discussed at TRANSSC level.

I guess that it’s too late to introduce new proposals for the current SSR6 revision cycle. However, I see this issue as safety-significant and urgent and think that we cannot wait until the next cycle. I understand that our proposal goes beyond but doesn’t contradict the requirements of SSR6 and that having TRANSSC conclusions stating this would be enough to reassure the colleagues of the ADR/ADN/RID joint meeting. Do you think it would make sense to have a short discussion at the June TRANSSC meeting, through a working group maybe restricted or preferentially open to ADR/AND/RID countries’ representatives?
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