The working group on tanks met from 13 to 15 September 2004, concurrently with the RID/ADR/ADN Joint Meeting which had entrusted it with a relevant mandate.

The working group considered the following official and informal documents:


* Circulated by the Central Office for International Carriage by Rail (OCTI) under the symbol OCTI/RID/GT-III/2004-A/Add.1.
The working group was made up of 19 experts from 10 countries and 3 international non-governmental organizations.

The order of discussion of the documents was determined by the presence of the experts.

1. **Document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2004/1 (Germany) and informal document INF.19 (Netherlands)**

   (Flame-traps for vacuum-relief valves/RID: and self-operating ventilation valves)

   In principle, the working group backed the documents; it recommends the adoption of the amendments proposed below. It was not considered necessary to take account of elevated temperature substances carried at or above their flash-point. The portion of the sentence in square brackets was therefore deleted.

   **Proposal**

   Add the following to 6.8.2.2.3:

   “… the provisions of 6.8.4, as indicated in Column (13) of Table A of Chapter 3.2”.

   Add the following new third subparagraph to 6.8.2.2.3:

   “Vacuum valves [RID: and self-operating ventilation valves] used on portable tanks intended for the carriage of substances meeting the flash-point criteria of Class 3, shall prevent the immediate passage of the flame into the tank, or the shell of the tank shall be capable of withstanding, without leakage, an explosion resulting from the passage of the flame.”

   **Transitional provisions (“tanks” means all types of tanks):**

   1.6.x.x. “Tanks constructed before 1 July 2007 in accordance with the requirements in force up to 31 December 2006 and which do not conform to the requirements of 6.8.2.2.3 concerning flame-arresters may still be used up to 31 December 2010.”

2. **Document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2004/2 (Germany)**

   (6.8.2.2.2, fourth subparagraph - Internal stop-valve control devices; 6.8.2.2.2, sixth subparagraph - Control devices for the filling and discharge devices)

   The purpose of this document is to clarify the terms “unintended opening” and “involuntary activation”. The relevant paragraphs of RID/ADR read:

   “Internal stop-valve control devices shall be so designed as to prevent any unintended opening through impact or an inadvertent act”, and

   “The filling and discharge devices (including flanges or threaded plugs) and protective caps (if any) shall be capable of being secured against any unintended opening.”
In the course of the discussion, it emerged that the examples quoted in the document were not representative of the range of possible solutions. In view of the large number of possible technical solutions, the working group recommends that the problem should be resolved in the context of work on standardization.

3. **Document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2004/3 (Germany)**

   (6.8.2.2.2 Specification of requirements for tank equipment)

   The proposal contained in this document was supported in principle by the working group; however, its details were modified. The changes basically concerned the relevance of the term “liquid tight” and a requirement with regard to pressure.

   The text prepared by the working group now reads:

   **Proposal**

   Replace the second and fifth indents of 6.8.2.2.2 of RID/ADR by the following:

   “– a closing device at the end of each pipe which may be a screw-threaded plug, a blank flange or an equivalent device. This device shall be leakproof so that the substance is retained with no loss. Measures shall be taken to ensure safe pressure relief in the discharge pipe before the closing device is completely removed.”

4. **Document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2004/5 (Germany)**

   (6.8.2.2.2 Chapter 1.2 and sections 4.3.2 and 6.8.2: Keeping a tank test record)

   The intentions of the proposal were kept although other parts were reworded. The text proposed by the working group therefore reads:

   **Proposal**

   (a) Add a new definition to Chapter 1.2:

   “**Tank record** means a file containing all the important technical information concerning a tank, a battery-wagon/battery-vehicle or an MEGC, as contained in the certificates referred to in 6.8.2.3, 6.8.2.4 and 6.8.3.4.”

   (b) Add a new 4.3.2.1.7:

   “The tank record shall be retained by the owner or operator. Owners or operators shall be able to provide this documentation at the request of any competent authority. The tank record shall be kept during the lifetime of the tank and conserved for 15 months after it is taken out of service.

   If the owner or operator changes during the lifetime of the tank, the tank file shall be transferred to the new owner or operator.
Copies of the tank record or of all necessary documents shall be made available to the expert for tests on tanks in accordance with 6.8.2.4.5 or 6.8.3.4.16 on the occasion of periodic tests or exceptional inspections.”

(c) Add the following new sentence to 6.8.2.3.1 as a new subparagraph:

“A copy of the certificate shall be attached to the tank record of each tank, battery-wagon/battery-vehicle or MEGC constructed (see 4.3.2.1.7).”

(d) Add the following new sentence to 6.8.2.4.5 and 6.8.3.4.16 as a new subparagraph:

“A copy of the certificate shall be attached to the tank record of each tank, battery-wagon/battery-vehicle or MEGC tested (see 4.3.2.1.7).”

(e) Add the following transitional measure (“tanks” means all types of tanks):

“1.6.x.x. For tanks constructed before 1 January 2007 which do not conform to the requirements of 4.3.2, 6.8.2.4 and 6.8.3.4 concerning the tank record, the compilation of documents for the tank record shall begin at latest at the time of the next periodic test.”

5. Document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2004/20 (France)

(Carriage of solids in tanks intended for the carriage of liquids)

The working group gave a favourable reception to this proposal for clarification and recommends that the Joint Meeting should adopt it with a minor addition.

Additional proposal

Amend the last sentence before the NOTE in the proposal for 4.3.4.1.2 to read:

“Examples:

− A tank with the tank code L10CN is authorized for the carriage of a substance to which the tank code L4BN has been assigned.

− A tank with the tank code L4BN is authorized for the carriage of a substance to which the tank code SGAN has been assigned.”

6. Informal document INF.9 (Germany)

(Chapters 4.2 and 6.7 United Nations portable tanks)

This document contains a draft of two proposals exclusively concerning United Nations portable tanks. This question has been discussed several times by the working group; to date it has not been possible to put forward any recommendation to the Joint Meeting to re-open the discussion.
The first proposal concerns the indication of the relevant tank instruction on the tank itself. This proposal, intended to bring into line the practice to be followed for United Nations portable tanks with that in force for RID/ADR tanks, was accepted by the working group and could be submitted to the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts as an official proposal if the Joint Meeting supported it.

The aim of the second proposal is to clarify and amend the definitions of “maximum allowable working pressure” and “design pressure” and to simplify how they are determined.

The working group equally supported this draft proposal and requests the Joint Meeting to support it also. Should it be approved, it is recommended that subsequent procedure should be that the secretariat should submit a relevant proposal to the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts on the basis of this document, as an opinion of the RID/ADR Joint Meeting.

7. Document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2004/16 (UIC) and informal document INF.12 (Netherlands)

(Chapters 1.3 and 4.3 Filling of tanks; Filling and discharge of tank-wagons; non-leakproofness of tank wagons)

In view of a content that was partially non-technical, the working group was only in a position to deal with the second question in document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2004/16 (“Do the provisions of 4.3.2.3.3 and 4.3.2.3.4 need further additions to ensure that more standard and optimum technical safety procedures are prescribed?”) in relation to the points mentioned in informal document INF.12 as “Steps towards a solution”.

The question of the leakproofness of all closing devices had already been discussed when document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2004/3 was considered. A leakproof stop-valve had been proposed.

The working group supported the intentions of the documents but did not consider that it was itself in a position to take a decision on the issue. It recommends that the Joint Meeting should support the application and begin by requesting the working group on tank and vehicle technology of the RID Committee of Experts to discuss the question and report on its conclusions to the Joint Meeting.


(Tank codes for certain substances of Class 3)

The need to carry certain flammable substances of Class 3, packing group I, in tanks with the tank code L4BN (substances which to date it was possible to carry in tanks with tank code L1.5BN) in the future was confirmed by the working group. The working group also recommends that the Joint Meeting should approve the proposal after considering the assignment of substances contained in the proposal.

The working group wishes to point out that transitional measures are required in view of this amendment. The majority opinion of the working group is that a longer transitional measure (5, 6 or 8 years depending on the type of tank) should be agreed once the amendment enters into force.
(Chapters 4.2, 4.3 and 6.8 Hierarchy of tanks and special provisions)

The working group did not consider the problems raised in the document. For the purpose of clarification, however, it specified that the special provisions listed in Column (13) of Table A of Chapter 3.2 refer in each case to the substance. A higher-performance tank must therefore satisfy these special provisions.

10. Document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2004/24 (France)  
(Implementation of the special provisions of 6.8.4)

The working group discussed this document and shared the opinion that difficulties of interpretation exist with regard to the implementation of certain special provisions which have quite obviously not been drafted sufficiently clearly for users.

This situation has led to different interpretations and measures for implementation depending on the States. The proposal to clarify them is a good approach to solving these problems. In order to cover all possible problems, other types of coordinated reflection are necessary in the various States.

The working group will continue its work by correspondence (e-mail) until the next meeting and will prepare a relevant proposal.

The working group requests the Joint Meeting to approve this course of action.

-----