

Appendix B

Report from the Legislation Working Group, Catez

Present: Bill Atkinson (chair), Hans Mucska, Roman Sykora

Items on the agenda:

1. Telematics and provision of emergency information
2. Proposed changes to the Hazard Warning Symbols for Classes 2.1 and 2.3
3. Guidance on vehicles with alternative energy supplies
4. The future of the Legislation Working Group

Item 1 - Telematics

Following on from the discussion at the last meeting about telematics and the action to submit an Information paper to the Joint Meeting. Some wording for the paper was agreed at the last meeting but since then other Information papers have been submitted to report on the work of the Telematics working group and on the initiative to establish a suite of international standards for telematics. It was therefore necessary to revise the agreed wording to make reference to these texts and to align our work accordingly.

Further work was carried out on the wording of the paper. This will be finalised shortly and translated into German by the German speaking members of the Legislation Working Group. It needs to be agreed who will attend the meeting to participate in the discussion.

Item 2 – Hazard Warning Symbols for Classes 2.1 and 2.3

An idea was raised suggesting changing the content of the Hazard Warning Symbols for gases that are flammable (Class 2.1) or toxic (Class 2.3) to more easily highlight the compressed gas hazard. After a short discussion prototype labels were drawn up accordingly. These are shown in Appendix 1.

The idea behind the proposals is to show the symbol for a compressed gas cylinder to more easily highlight the compressed gas hazard (other than the small numbers currently used). There are four options put forward. Two of these options include removal of the hazard warning in English. The use of the cylinder symbol would make Class 2.1 and 2.3 Hazard Warning Symbols more consistent with Class 2.2 and the GHS marking for compressed gases.

The next stage is to seek Commission member views on the suggestions and which, if any, of the options presented would be the best to write up formally into a proposal paper for the UN.

Item 3 –Guidance on Vehicles with Alternative Energy Supplies

Roman raised the issue of guidance on dealing with incidents involving vehicles with alternative energy supplies, for example electric, hybrid or fuel cell technologies. He asked if there was any common guidance available and on the practice in other

member countries. For example, Austria has a guidance document of 34 pages in German. It was therefore decided to ask the other Commission members for this information and whether it would be a good idea to develop some common guidance, perhaps under the name of CTIF.







Item 4 – Future of the Legislation Working Group

The work of the Legislation Working Group is important in raising the external profile of CTIF and in working up ideas generated within the Commission as well as commenting on other proposals and initiatives. However, the Working Group has had a low number of members for some time meaning that this limits both the scope of the discussion and places a high burden on the few members to complete the necessary work. It is therefore suggested that the work of the Legislation Working Group either be shared with another Working Group or that the Legislation Working Group asks to co-opt members from other Working Groups at each meeting to work on specific agenda items. The views of the remainder of the Commission are sought on this matter.

Recommendations

1. To complete the work on an Information Paper (in English and in German) to submit to the Joint Meeting
2. To seek volunteers to present the Information Paper to the JM
3. To ask the opinions of the other members of the Commission on the proposals to change the Hazard Warning Symbols for Classes 2.1 and 2.3
4. To canvass other Commission members on current guidance on incidents involving vehicles with alternative energy sources and whether to develop some common guidance under the CTIF name
5. For other members to contribute their views on the future operation of the Legislation Working Group.

Appendix 1 – Options for Revision to Class 2 Hazard Warning Symbols

Existing	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
				
	<p>No change</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>No change</p>

Existing	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
