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1. Reference to EN 12807 in the table in RID/ADR 6.2.4

1.1 In March 2009 the Working Group on Standards recommended a reference to the revised issue of EN 12308 (see 2.5 of INF 42). However, a proposal for a transition regulation was postponed to await the outcome of the ECMA-WG. In September 2009 EN 12807 wasn’t included in the tables of WP 44, unfortunately, and no decision specific to EN 12807 was taken.

1.2 At OTIF secretariat’s request and as result of an email-consultation with the participants of the STD’s WG it was realized that EN 12807:2001 first appeared in RID/ADR on 1 January 2005 and continued to be referenced in the 2007 and 2009 editions, so it is valid for new type approvals until 31 December 2012 under our two year transition rule. EN 12807:2008 will appear for the first time in the RID/ADR on 1 January 2011. Taking the lead from the example from the ECMA working group given on page 5 of paper ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2009/3, it is proposed to amend the existing reference to EN 12807 in the table in RID/ADR 6.2.4 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title of document</th>
<th>Applicable sub-sections and paragraphs</th>
<th>Applicable for new type approvals or for renewals</th>
<th>Latest date for withdrawal of existing type approvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN 12807:2001</td>
<td>Transportable refillable brazed steel cylinders for liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) – Design and construction</td>
<td>6.2.3.1 and 6.2.3.4</td>
<td>Between 1 January 2005 and 31 December 2012</td>
<td>31 December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(except Annex A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN 12807:2008</td>
<td>Transportable refillable brazed steel cylinders for liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) – Design and construction</td>
<td>6.2.3.1 and 6.2.3.4</td>
<td>Until further notice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Reference to EN 3 in ADR 8.1.4.3

2.1 At its session in September 2009 the Joint Meeting addressed some standards referenced in ADR, which have been updated without involvement of the Standards Working Group, so far (see ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC1/116, paragraph 16). One of the examples is the standard EN 3, referenced in ADR 8.1.4.3 which requires that the extinguishing agent of portable fire extinguishers shall comply with the relevant requirements of EN 3 Portable fire extinguishers, Parts 1 to 6. However, it was noted that the standards EN 3-1:1996, EN 3-2:1996, EN 3-4:1996 and EN 3-5:1996 have been replaced by EN 3-7:2004+A1:2007. It was proposed to adapt the existing reference in the first paragraph in subparagraph 8.1.4.3 according to the revisions made.

2.2 The Members of the Joint Meeting were invited by a special enquiry, dated 24.9.2009, to examine the case. Comments were received from Belgium, Germany, Switzerland and the UK with the following results:

2.2.1 It is understood that ADR 8.1.4.3 is deemed to describe minimum requirements on portable fire extinguishers (… shall be suitable for use on a vehicle …) in contrast to fixed devices described in the 2nd paragraph of this subsection. It complements subsections 8.1.4.1 (“fire extinguishers … suitable for fighting a fire in the engine or cab of the transport unit”) and 8.1.4.2 (additional equipment related to the permissible mass of the transport unit). Consequently, the Belgium suggestion to replace “extinguishing agent” by “extinguishers” or better “portable fire extinguishers” should be followed.

2.2.2 With respect to Part 6, it is made aware that it shall be replaced by Part 10, which has already been adopted as the result of the formal vote process, ending 16.9.2009. The operation plan indicates publication till 31.5.2010.

WP.15 will have to decide either to refer to EN 3-10:2009 or to keep the reference to EN 3-6:1995/A1:1999 (noting that this last alternative would suggest the use of a withdrawn standard at the date of implementation of ADR 2011).

2.2.3 As a consequence of the revisions of EN 3, where Parts 1 – 5 have been replaced by Part 7 and complemented by Parts 8, 9 and 10 it is suggested to revise the first paragraph of ADR subsection 8.1.4.3 as follows:


Switzerland opposed a reference to Parts 8 – 10 because these Parts have not been provided and mentioned before.

Comment by the CEN Consultant:
The objections should be reconsidered with the following arguments:
– EN 3 is no standard dedicated to the transport of dangerous goods.
– The requirements of ADR on portable fire-fighting equipment are termed as factors of number and capacity (mass of filling) of extinguishers apart from the general requirement “suitable for fighting a fire …”. In the absence of any other technical requirement in ADR no standard could be in contradiction to ADR.
– EN 3 has been set up and agreed upon by fire-fighting experts organized in CEN/TC 70 – Manual means of fire-fighting equipment – with a broad participation of more than 20 national members. As an example, Part 10 has recently been approved with 23 positive votes, one negative vote and one abstention. Switzerland as all the other European members had all options to participate and to influence the contents of this standard.
– To the best of my knowledge, neither the Joint Meeting nor WP.15 have ever assessed the compliance of EN 3 with the requirements of ADR when this standard was first taken into reference.
– It will make no difference, whether Parts 8 – 9 will be referred to in ADR because the marking clauses require only an “EN 3”-mark and extinguishers acc. to Parts 8 and 9 are on the market. Part 10 reflects the EU conformity assessment scheme and no manufacturer will be in the position to stick with the former procedures of Part 6.
2.3 Observations by the CEN Consultant

As a by-product of the review of the references to EN-standards in ADR 8.1.4.3 some options for improvement were detected and it is proposed to consider the following amendments of section 8.1.4:

− Term “extinguishing agent”: In contrast to all other appearances 8.1.4.1(a) reads “extinguishant agent”: Alignment is proposed.

− Term “fighting a fire in the engine”: It is assumed that a fire in the engine bay/compartment and not in the engine itself shall be extinguished. Amendment to read “fighting a fire in engine bay” or “…engine compartment” is suggested.

− “or” in 8.1.4.3, 2nd para., last line. It seems that “or” should be deleted. However, the first part of the sentence would also make sense, alone. The second part was not understood in context with the first part and could possibly be deleted as well.